

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition

PROFESSOR R. H. FULLER of Evanston, Illinois, has written the section on the New Testament in a new book about the Bible and its contents, entitled *The Book of the Acts of God*.<sup>1</sup> This book will be reviewed as a whole in a subsequent issue, but there are parts of it which seemed to merit fuller representation than a review permits.

The chapter on Jesus, for instance, is a notable one. Professor FULLER writes in full awareness of the current tendency to discount the Gospels as reliable sources for recovering an historical account of the life of Jesus, and to regard them rather as just one of the mediums used by the Early Church to proclaim her faith. They are evidence of the 'kerygma' but not of the facts about the historical Jesus. Professor FULLER does not dispute that the primary aim of the Gospels is to 'evoke faith', and not to provide an impartial and merely factual collection of information. But he raises a timely protest against regarding these two points of view as mutually exclusive alternatives.

He writes: 'The dilemma is not a true one. It is not really a question of either-or, *either* history or proclamation. As is so often the case, it is a question of both-and: *both* history and proclamation. The proclamation involves an interpretation precisely of history, and the gospel material consists of historical traditions (including recollections of things Jesus said and did) shaped and moulded so as to convey the proclamation. It is quite legitimate to use the methods of historical and literary criticism which were forged during the liberal period in order to reconstruct the underlying history. It is not only legitimate, it is also imperative to do so. For if the Christian proclamation involves an interpretation of a particular history, we have a right to know what that particular history was. This does not mean that our reconstruction of the history will prove that the gospel's interpretation of that history is

true. The truth of the Christian proclamation is always a matter for personal decision for those who hear it proclaimed by the Church. But at least we have the right to be assured that the decision we are invited to make is wholly consonant with the character of that history, and not an imposition upon it.'

A little later Professor FULLER returns to emphasize the same point again: 'After the first Easter, the disciples inevitably and rightly read the previous history in the light of the new insight into its meaning which Easter had forced upon them, and all the accounts of Jesus are inevitably and rightly coloured by that insight. The task of the historian is to penetrate behind that insight and to lay bare the course of the history as it was actually happening. This is a hazardous and delicate task, and many would deny its feasibility. But the nettle must be grasped.'

All this is well said, and it is not just one individual opinion, but is representative of a discernible changing of opinion among New Testament scholars. Other indications of the same trend are to be seen in J. M. Robinson's book, 'A New Quest of the Historical Jesus' and Bornkamm's book, recently translated into English, on 'Jesus of Nazareth'. This latter book is of special interest because the writer belongs to the Bultmann school of thought, which had declared the impossibility of recovering a true picture of the historical Jesus. Bornkamm, however—though he makes no attempt to reconstruct a chronological account of the life of Jesus—does present, out of those materials he regards as reliable, a compelling portrait of the human figure of Jesus.

Professor FULLER confidently affirms that in the materials provided in the Four Gospels there are the adequate means of constructing such a portrait. He writes: 'Behind the words of

<sup>1</sup> Duckworth; 35s. net.



Jesus and the memories about him—even behind those words and memories whose authenticity is doubtful—there shines the self-authenticating portrait of a real person in all his human uniqueness, an impression which is accessible alike to the layman and to the expert, to believer and non-believer. No reader of the gospel story can fail to be impressed by Jesus' humble submission to the will of God on the one hand, and his mastery of all situations on the other; by his penetrating discernment of human motives and his authoritative demand of radical obedience on the one hand, and his gracious forgiving acceptance of sinners on the other. There is nothing either in the Messianic hopes of pre-Christian Judaism or in the later Messianic beliefs of the early Christian Church to account for this portrait. It is character-

ized by an originality and freshness which is beyond the power of invention.'

We are reminded, however, that the historical portrait does not automatically produce Christian faith: 'Such an encounter with the historical Jesus is of course not the same as Christian faith in him. Even Caiaphas, Herod and Pontius Pilate encountered him in this way. Christian faith is still a matter of decision—either this Man is God's redemptive act, or he is not. Nor is the historical Jesus the object of our faith. That object is the Risen Christ preached by the Church. But the Risen Christ is in continuity with the historical Jesus, and it is the historical Jesus which makes the Risen Christ not just an abstraction, but clothes him with flesh and blood.'

## Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times

### The Way of the Will of God

#### The Stoics—IV.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM BARCLAY, D.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

For the Stoic all other branches of study existed for the sake of ethics. If the Stoic speculated in thought, it was to discover how to live in life and action.<sup>1</sup>

The Stoic ethic took its origin and its authority from the Stoic conception of God. There is a certain inescapability in God. You may call Him by many names but He is still the same God. You may call Him Fate or Nature.<sup>2</sup> You may call Him Necessity or the Universal Law which men and gods must obey.<sup>3</sup> 'We understand Jove to be the ruler and guardian of the Universe, lord and artificer of this fabric. Every name is his. Would you call him Fate? You will not err. He it is on whom all things depend, the cause of causes. Would you call him Providence? You will speak aright. He it is whose thought provides for the Universe that it may move on its course unhurt and do its part. Would you call him Nature?

You will not speak amiss. He it is of whom all things are born, by whose breath we live. Would you call him the Universe? You will not be deceived. He himself is this whole that you see, fills his own parts, sustains himself and what is his.'<sup>4</sup> He is there Himself, and He has His *daimons*, His divine messengers, who watch, not as spies, but in kindness over all.<sup>5</sup> Even if some of them are mischievous spirits whom God may employ as His executioners,<sup>6</sup> every man from birth to death has his genius watching over him.<sup>7</sup> 'When you have shut your doors and made darkness within, remember never to say that you are alone, for you are not; but God is within and your *daimon*; and what need have they of light to see what you are doing?'<sup>8</sup>

As the Stoic saw and felt it, God is even closer than beside us, for God is also within. 'God is near you, with you, within you. I say it, Lucilius,

<sup>1</sup> Diogenes Laertius, vii. 84; Epictetus, *Discourses*, iii. 2; Stobaeus, *Ecl.*, ii. 5; Seneca, *Letters*, lxxxix. 14, xc. 65.

<sup>2</sup> Seneca, *De Ben.*, IV. vii. 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Cicero *De Natura Deorum*, I. xv. 39; *The Hymn of Cleanthes*, 38, 39.

<sup>4</sup> Seneca, *N.Q.*, ii. 45; Diogenes Laertius, vii. 147.

<sup>5</sup> Diogenes Laertius, vii. 151.

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch, *Qu. Rom.*, 57.

<sup>7</sup> Epictetus, *Discourses*, I. xiv. 12; Seneca, *Letters*, cx. 1; Horace, *Ep.*, II. ii. 187-189.

<sup>8</sup> Epictetus, *Discourses*, I. xiv. 13, 14.



a holy spirit sits within us, spectator of our evil and our good, our guardian.' <sup>1</sup>

In view of this there is only one true worship, and that worship can never be a thing of ritual or of liturgy however splendid; it must be the worship of the clean hands and the pure heart.

Would you propitiate the gods? Be good! He has worshipped them enough who has imitated them.' <sup>2</sup> The best and the purest and the holiest worship is to venerate the gods 'with purity, sincerity and innocence both of thought and speech'. <sup>3</sup> In prayer a man should ask nothing of the gods in private which he could not ask in public. 'So live with your fellow-men as if God sees you; so speak with God, as if all men hear you.' <sup>4</sup> The whole of Juvenal's tenth *Satire* is a long lament for the way in which men pray for the things which in fact ruin them—money, power, long life, beauty. 'If you ask my counsel, you will leave it to the gods themselves to provide what is good for us, and what will be serviceable for our state; for, in place of what is pleasing they will give us what is best. Man is dearer to them than he is to himself.' <sup>5</sup> In the last analysis the one prayer which the Stoic must pray is, 'Thy will be done', which was indeed the prayer of Epictetus. 'Be bold to look towards God and say, Use me henceforward for whatever Thou wilt; I am of one mind with Thee; I am Thine; I crave exemption from nothing which seems good in Thy sight; lead me where Thou wilt.' <sup>6</sup> Here, then, is the essence of the Stoic ethic—'Thy will be done'.

In one sense the Stoic held that a man would in the end have to say precisely that, whether he liked it or not. As Seneca saw, there are three possible views of the Universe and of what happens in it. All things take place by Fate, in the sense of an impersonal necessity by which all things are ordered and settled. Or, the world is ruled by a Divine Providence, which is a personal will. Or, fortune is supreme, and there is neither sense nor purpose in life. <sup>7</sup>

The Stoic is, in the first instance, clear that all things happen by Fate. <sup>8</sup> Fate is the endless chain of causation by which things are and happen. <sup>9</sup> Aetius in the *Placita* passes down a whole series of definitions some of which will point us on to the next step. 'Fate', said Zeno, 'is a power which

stirs matter by the same laws and in the same way.' 'The essence of Fate', said Chrysippus, 'is a spiritual force duly regulating the Universe.' Fate is the Logos, the Reason of the Universe, the law of events providentially ordered throughout the Universe. It is the law by which things that have been have been, things which are are, and things which will be will be. <sup>10</sup>

'*Εἰσαρπυμένη*, Fate, is one of the supreme Stoic words. But from those definitions something has begun to shine through. As E. V. Arnold puts it: 'Fate is not a blind, helpless sequence of events, but an active and wise power which regulates the Universe'. <sup>11</sup> Fate is the Logos, the World Reason. We are now face to face with the next great Stoic word, *Προνοία*, which means Providence, for to the Stoic it is not so much Fate as Providence which governs the world. Providence immediately personalizes Fate. With eloquence Cicero pleads that it is nothing short of impiety to despoil the gods of their providential activity. If the gods are perfect, they are intelligent, and if they are intelligent they must act in the guidance and the sustaining of the Universe. <sup>12</sup> The aim of this Providence is to create a Universe which can endure, a Universe which is complete, and to endow that universe with every beauty and excellence, <sup>13</sup> and all for the sake of men. <sup>14</sup> The world is a home or a city in which God and man share. <sup>15</sup> Again and again the Stoics stress the beneficence of the power which controls the Universe. 'God is a living being, blessed, imperishable, the benefactor of mankind.' <sup>16</sup> God is not greedy and jealous, God is kind. <sup>17</sup> The gods are conspiring together to preserve and to protect the Universe. <sup>18</sup> All the utility and the gifts of the Universe are due to the divine benevolence towards man. The things in this world are 'marvellously governed' by the divine wisdom 'for the safety and the preservation of man.' The gods care for all human beings. <sup>19</sup> Chrysippus takes this to fantastic lengths. The horse was created to assist men in battle and the dog in hunting; the sow for sacrifice, the peacock for his tail; the lion and the leopard to discipline

<sup>10</sup> All these definitions are in Aetius, *Placita*, I. xxviii. 3.

<sup>11</sup> E. V. Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, 202.

<sup>12</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. xvi. 44, II. xxiii. 60–II. xxx. 80.

<sup>13</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. xxii. 58.

<sup>14</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. lxi. 154.

<sup>15</sup> Seneca, *To Marcia*, xviii. 1; Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. lxii. 54.

<sup>16</sup> Plutarch, *Sto. Rep.*, xxxviii. 3; Diogenes Laertius, vii. 147.

<sup>17</sup> Seneca, *De Ira*, II. xxvii. 2; *De Ben.*, VII. xxxi. 4.

<sup>18</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. xxiii. 60.

<sup>19</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. liii. 132, II. lxvi. 164.

<sup>1</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, xli. 1, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, xcv. 47–50.

<sup>3</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. xxviii. 71.

<sup>4</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, x. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Juvenal, *Satires*, x. 345–350.

<sup>6</sup> Epictetus, *Discourses*, II. xvi. 42; *Manual*, 8.

<sup>7</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, xvi. 4, 5.

<sup>8</sup> Diogenes Laertius, vii. 149; Cicero, *De Fato*, xv. 33.

<sup>9</sup> Diogenes Laertius, vii. 149; Cicero, *De Div.*, I. lv.

125; Seneca, *N.Q.*, ii. 36; *Letters*, xix. 6.



men in courage; the flea to waken us from sleep, and the mouse to prevent us from being careless in leaving cheese lying about!<sup>1</sup> In view of all this two things have to be said. The one is a side issue, but a very necessary side issue, the other is one of the most central of all Stoic doctrines.

First, there is the question, If there is Fate and Providence, if there is this detailed government and care of God, how can evil exist at all?<sup>2</sup> To this question the Stoics gave a variety of answers. Nothing can exist without its opposite. If there is good, there must be evil; if there is courage, there must be cowardice; there can be no demand for justice, unless there is injustice, nor for truth, unless there is falsehood.<sup>3</sup> There is the doctrine of consequence. Since the head is compacted of small and delicate bones, there is a necessary consequence that it is easily injured.<sup>4</sup> God's purpose can be thwarted by the perverseness of men, and a son can use even a precious inheritance for evil.<sup>5</sup> God like a Roman father or a trainer can train His child in virtue by hardening and strengthening him through trouble. Sometimes God *fortiter amat*, strenuously loves a man.<sup>6</sup> Sometimes the evil-doer himself escapes punishment and the punishment falls on future generations.<sup>7</sup> The disasters of the wicked can be warnings to others.<sup>8</sup> Sometimes there are actions of God which as we are and from our standpoint we cannot understand.<sup>9</sup>

The second matter is twofold. If everything is of Fate, how can there be free-will? The Stoic insists that there still remains something in man.<sup>10</sup> The one thing that is in man's power is *assent*. He can give or withhold his assent to any invitation to goodness or any seduction to evil; he can give or withhold his assent to the knowledge that everything comes from God. The Stoics spoke of *proximate* and *principal* causes, and Cicero used a vivid analogy. If a boy sets a cylinder rolling downhill, he provides it with an opportunity

without which it could not have rolled; that is the *proximate* cause. But the cylinder would not have rolled, unless it had been the nature of cylinders to roll downhill; that is the *principal* cause.<sup>11</sup> Now no man can form any judgment of any kind without a *phantasia*, a mental impression coming to him; that is the proximate cause; but the assent he gives to that judgment is in himself and in his own power; that is the *principal* cause. So Alexander of Aphrodisias can say that all things take place according to destiny, but not all things according to necessity.<sup>12</sup> It has been said that Fate is what a man *must* do; Destiny is what he is *meant* to do; and in speaking of the relationship between thinking man and God what the Stoics really meant by Fate is almost Destiny.

Now, if a man's assent is in his own power—and here we come to the very essence of Stoicism—a man may assent to whatever happens, in the certainty that it comes from the will of God, in which case he will know happiness and peace, for, whatever the thing feels like, it must be good because God sent it. Or, the man may refuse his assent to the thing and rebel against it and resent it, in which case he is battering his head against the Universe, and can know nothing but unhappiness and dispeace. In other words, it is within a man's power of assent to say, or not to say, Thy will be done. And in the last analysis the whole of Stoic ethics consists in learning to say, Thy will be done, in the certainty that everything comes from God and is, therefore, good. Epictetus advises, 'Do not seek to have everything that happens happen as you wish, but wish for everything to happen as it actually does, and your life will be serene'.<sup>13</sup> In other words, 'If you cannot get what you want, teach yourself to want what you get—and it ought to be possible for your will to assent to that, because you know that everything that comes to you, comes from God, who is good'.

We have now seen the Stoic view of God and of the world, and, before we can go on to define the Stoic idea of virtue and of goodness more closely, it will be better if we look now at the Stoic conception of man and of human nature, for very naturally it is from the Stoic conception of man that the Stoic conception of virtue comes.

The Stoic had no doubt of the dignity of man. Man is a *sacra res*, a sacred thing.<sup>14</sup> Man obviously has a body. On the body there are two Stoic lines of thought, of which one is the main line, and the other a divergence which was the typical product of its time. The main line of Stoic thought is

<sup>1</sup> Chrysippus in Arnim, ii. 1152, 1163, quoted in full in E. V. Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, 205, footnote 39.

<sup>2</sup> What follows on this subject is a summary of E. V. Arnold's treatment of it in *Roman Stoicism*, 206–209.

<sup>3</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, cxxiv. 19; Aulus Gellius, *N.A.*, VII. i. 4, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Aulus Gellius, *N.A.*, VII. i. 9, 11.

<sup>5</sup> Cleanthes, *Hymn*, 18; Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, III. xxvii. 70.

<sup>6</sup> Seneca, *De Prov.*, iv. 7, ii. 6; Epictetus, *Discourses*, I. xxiv. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, III. xxxvii. 90; Seneca, *De Ben.*, IV. xxxii. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Plutarch, *Sto. Rep.*, xv. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Lactantius, *De Ira*, 13.

<sup>10</sup> Aulus Gellius, *N.A.*, VII. ii. 15; Seneca, *N.Q.*, II. xxxviii. 3; Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.*, vi. 258.

<sup>11</sup> Cicero, *De Fato*, xix. 43.

<sup>12</sup> Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Fato*, 10.

<sup>13</sup> Epictetus, *Manual*, 8.

<sup>14</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, xcvi. 93.



exactly the line of Paul, when he said that the body is the temple of the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup> The body is inhabited by its divinity, even if it is only a *breve hospitium*, a brief resting-place for the divine.<sup>2</sup> The very structure of the body is the proof of the divine wisdom and the divine love and care for man.<sup>3</sup> Man's upright carriage shows that he was meant by God to look up and to contemplate God and the heavens and the Universe; man is the upward looker.<sup>4</sup> Clearly the body ought to be held in reverence and respect,<sup>5</sup> and since the soul is dependent on the body for its nurture, it is the wise man's duty to care for the health of the body,<sup>6</sup> and to have a healthy mind in a healthy body, *mens sana in corpore sano*.<sup>7</sup> In the main line of Stoic thought there is certainly no contempt for the body.

But there is, mainly in Seneca and Epictetus, a side-line of thought in which the body is hated and despised, a line which echoes the Orphic catch-word *σῶμα σῆμα*, the body is a tomb. The flesh is evil, much as Paul saw it.<sup>8</sup> The body is no better than the prison-house of the soul.<sup>9</sup> It is the body which corrupts the will.<sup>10</sup> The body is the husk,<sup>11</sup> the ass which its owner should always be willing to abandon,<sup>12</sup> the hindrance which a wise man will want to lay aside for ever.<sup>13</sup> But this line is not characteristically Stoic; it is part of the Gnostic dualism which had invaded Hellenistic thought from the East, and which could issue in asceticism and even self-mutilation.<sup>14</sup>

But clearly the most important part of man is the soul. The universe is a macrocosm, a big universe, and man is a microcosm, a little universe, and just as God penetrates the Universe the soul penetrates the man.<sup>15</sup> But it is what the soul is that is of such tremendous importance. The ruling part of the soul, reason, is a part of the divine spirit merged in man, God in the human body.<sup>16</sup> The soul is God *hospitantem in corpore humano*,

taking up His lodging in a human body.<sup>17</sup> It is possible to say to a man, 'You are God'.<sup>18</sup> The soul is part of the divine fire. It is fiery breath, kindled air, fiery and intelligent spirit, just as God is.<sup>19</sup> 'When you are in social intercourse, when you are exercising yourself, when you are in discussion, know you not that you are nourishing a god, that you are exercising a god? Wretch, you are carrying about a god with you, and you know it not.'<sup>20</sup> We have only to think what a conviction like that must have meant to a slave who was no more in the eyes of the law and of his master than 'a living tool'.

The soul is compounded of the four different elements, and the character of a man will depend on the nature of the mixture, on his 'temperament'. A predominance of fire, air, earth, water, will make a man fervid, frigid, dull, moist.<sup>21</sup> The soul has eight parts or eight activities.<sup>22</sup> There is τὸ ἡγεμονικόν, the governing part, as E. V. Arnold calls it, 'the principate'. There are the five senses, and the powers of speech and of generation. The governing part rules the others, and is located in the heart. The Stoics derived καρδιά from κρατεῖν, which means to grip or to control.<sup>23</sup>

Obviously the governing part is all-important. It is the reason, the intellect, the will, the power of action, the pilot, the king, the law giver, the God within.<sup>24</sup> It is obvious that the governing part must control the appetites, the ὄρμαι, the impulses to get, and the ἀφορμαί, the impulses to avoid.<sup>25</sup> Such impulses are the raw material of action, and when they are directed by the will they become reasonable desire, and when they defy the will they become unreasonable desire or concupiscence.<sup>26</sup> It is in the assent of the will, of the governing part of the soul to these impulses and appetites that goodness and evil lie.<sup>27</sup> The governing spirit must be governed by God for only in doing His will is our peace.

It remains now to see Stoic virtue in practice.

[To be concluded.]

<sup>1</sup> 1 Co 6<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, cxx. 14, xcii. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. liv. 58.

<sup>4</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, xciv. 56; *On Leisure*, v. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, xcii. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, x. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Juvenal, *Satires*, x. 356.

<sup>8</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, cxx. 17, xcii. 10.

<sup>9</sup> Seneca, *To Marcia*, xxiv. 5; *To Helvia*, xi. 6, 7.

<sup>10</sup> Epictetus, *Discourses*, I. iii. 3, 7.

<sup>11</sup> Epictetus, *Discourses*, I. xxiii. 1.

<sup>12</sup> Epictetus, *Discourses*, IV. i. 79, 80.

<sup>13</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, lxxv. 16, xcii. 33; *To Helvia*, xi. 6.

<sup>14</sup> Seneca, *N.Q.*, VII. xxxi. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Philodemus, *Piet.*, 15; Seneca, *Letters*, lxxv. 24;

Philo, *Rer. Div.*, i. 494.

<sup>16</sup> Seneca, *To Helvia*, vii. 7; *Letters*, lxxvi. 12.

<sup>17</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, xxxi. 11.

<sup>18</sup> Cicero, *Rep.*, VI. xxiv. 26.

<sup>19</sup> Cicero, *Tusc.*, I. x. 19, I. xviii. 42; Aetius, *Plac.*, IV. iii. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Epictetus, *Discourses*, II. viii. 12.

<sup>21</sup> Seneca, *De Ira*, II. xix. 1, 2.

<sup>22</sup> Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Anima*, 118; Tertullian, *De Anima*, xiv; Stobaeus, *Ecl.*, I. xlix. 33.

<sup>23</sup> Galen, *Plac. Hipp. et Plat.*, iii. 5.

<sup>24</sup> Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Anima*, 98; Galen, *Plac. Hipp. et Plat.*, ii. 2; Cicero, *De Officiis*, I. xxx. 107; Epictetus, *Discourses*, I. i. 4, I. xiv. 14.

<sup>25</sup> Cicero, *Academics*, II. viii. 24.

<sup>26</sup> Epictetus, *Discourses*, IV. xi. 6, 7.

<sup>27</sup> Seneca, *Letters*, cxiii. 18; Diogenes Laertius, vii. 111; Cicero, *Tusc.*, IV. vii. 14.



## Literature

### DUNKELD

WHATEVER part of the Church a minister may serve, he is sure to profit by reading *The Minister's Devotions*, by the Rev. C. R. Walker, M.A. (St. Andrew Press; 20s. net). Retreats are not yet a strong factor in Scottish Church life, but one especially, held annually at Dunkeld, has abundantly justified itself. Much of what Mr. Walker writes is based upon experience gained there, and the papers here collected were mainly delivered on those occasions. The first deals with the priority of prayer. While full emphasis is placed on this, the author is refreshingly practical. To shirk household work or the care of the children in order to spend longer in prayer would be grossly selfish. The suggestive title of ch. 2 is 'The Study as Oratory'. The wise advice comes home with force to the reviewer, whose study was Scott Holland's Oratory. No opinion is more dangerous than to suggest that effective preaching can be given by the power of the Spirit alone, without deep and costly reading. The reader will be impressed by Mr. Walker's generous 'catholicity'. Three models chosen for a young minister are Aquinas, Anselm, and Calvin—and especially Anselm. Latin prayers are best used in the original tongue, for thus the minister enters into the praying fellowship of Christendom. A busy life can still be filled with moments of ejaculatory prayer, keeping the pastor in constant touch with his Lord. Bodily posture and gesture have their importance, many devotional aids, such as the sign of the Cross, are valuable. A chapter is devoted to the special problems of the country minister. Chalmers, Herbert, Keble, and Rutherford are the models here. Mr. Walker's own deep spirituality emerges most clearly in the paper on Intercession. The minister not only prays, so far as may be, for his people one by one, but also he prays day by day *in their stead*, and confesses not only his own sins, but theirs. If it be said that the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers should exempt him from this onerous task, it must be replied that the doctrine is honoured in theory rather than practice. The priestly function of the parish minister cannot be over-stressed. And let him not forget that even he himself may fall into deadly sin. An interesting chapter describes in some detail what happens at a Retreat. Monday evening till Friday morning is a satisfactory period. Holy Communion is celebrated before breakfast each morning. Silence is generally observed till one o'clock and again for an hour or

two in the evening. An Anglican reviewer welcomes the news that a Retreat from which all discussion was banned proved very edifying. A minister on holiday must make sure not to let down his devotional life. Retirement gives a wonderful opportunity for prayer. A very useful chapter on devotional literature concludes this outstanding work.

FREDERIC HOOD

### THE TEXT OF THE N.T.

A new book by Dr. Vincent Taylor is something of an event. Few scholars write from such a comprehensive knowledge of the New Testament, and few have so high a degree of that teaching skill which makes his works so orderly and clear. There is sure, therefore, to be an eager welcome for his latest book, entitled *The Text of the New Testament: A Short Introduction* (Macmillan; 15s. net). It springs out of Dr. Taylor's life-time's study of the subject, and from his experience in both teaching and examining it.

One important feature of the book is that it is carefully selective in the information it includes. It does not aim at providing a compendium of detailed and encyclopaedic information for the expert, but an adequate introduction to the subject for those who are new to it. For instance, the author reviews and characterises only eight out of the large number of uncials. Those which play no considerable part in determining the original text are passed by. Similarly only those Patristic writers receive consideration whose works are of real importance to the subject. The reader is spared the embarrassment of finding himself confronted with a mass of names and symbols, and not knowing which of them are worth getting to know and memorizing. He can feel quite certain that whatever is included is worth knowing.

The subject is introduced in a series of chapters arranged in orderly development. We learn about the Purpose and Method of Textual Criticism, the manner of referring to the Manuscripts, the Papyri, Uncials and Minuscules, Versions and Patristic Quotations, and the chief printed editions of the Greek Text. The Textual Theory of Westcott and Hort receives careful treatment, and also the later contribution of Streeter, and developments since his day.

Then comes a most valuable closing chapter, called 'Notes on Select Readings'. Dr. Taylor chooses several important passages in which the



Manuscripts provide variant readings; he presents the Textual evidence for the variants, sifts and weighs it, and argues which reading on the evidence has claims to be considered the original one. This chapter will greatly help students, for whom it is a great advantage to have not only the factual evidence, but an illustration of the way it can be evaluated in actual instances.

It is interesting to find, in this last chapter, that in one or two cases Dr. Taylor's judgment coincides with that of the translators of the New English Bible. For example, he accepts as original the reading, *Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν* of Mt 27<sup>16-17</sup>, and *ὀργισθεῖς* instead of *σπλαγχνισθεῖς* in Mk 1<sup>41</sup>. As we should expect, wise and balanced judgments are to be found in every instance. On the prayer in Lk 23<sup>34</sup> ('Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do') he comments: 'On the whole it would appear that the genuineness of the prayer is highly probable, but that its place in the text of Luke is uncertain'.

Students will find in this book an admirable introduction to what many find a difficult subject. From it they will learn easily the elements of requisite knowledge and the way to use it. For many this will be all they want for their immediate purpose. It will enable them to use, for instance, the critical apparatus provided in the new edition of the Greek Text recently issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society. For others it may well awaken an interest in a new field of study, and a desire for more.

C. L. MITTON

### WORSHIP IN THE WORLD'S RELIGIONS

Dr. Geoffrey Parrinder having spent many years in West Africa and recently visited Asia has gained acquaintance at first hand with a variety of modes of worship in the religions with which he has come into contact in these regions, in addition to his wide knowledge of the religions of the world in general. In *Worship in the World's Religions* (Faber and Faber; 21s. net) he has concentrated attention on this important aspect of the subject from the standpoint of the laity rather than on the cultus performed by priests and ritual experts. It is, of course, impossible to make a clear cut division between sacerdotal and congregational worship as the one is so inextricably interwoven with the other everywhere, as is in fact somewhat inadvertently indicated in this book. Strictly private rites usually tend to be primarily magical operations, often illicit, especially in the lower cultures, whereas religious worship is held in public at temples and shrines for the well-being of the community at large. It is mainly in the higher developments of faith and practice that genuinely religious and mystical devotions

are made in seclusion without the aid of an intervening agent.

The method adopted in this comparative study is to give a brief summary of the main tenets and distinctive features of each religion brought under review, followed by an account of the cultus, its shrines, temples, modes of worship, festivals, prayers, sacred places and pilgrimages, and objects of devotion, with short selected bibliographies. The approach and explanations are strictly and most commendably impartial and objective without suggesting that 'all religions are of equal value and can be mixed up in a synthesis'. Dr. Parrinder's objectivity is of the right kind based on his own personal understanding and practice of his own faith. As he truly says, 'the need to-day is for a fair and sympathetic understanding of the facts of other religious beliefs and ways of worship'; not a vague hotch-potch of all religions. This is admirably achieved throughout, not least in the discussion of Christianity in the final chapter where a balanced and accurate picture of the various modes of Catholic and Protestant worship is given, and their underlying theological pre-suppositions. Rather more attention might have been paid to the recent Liturgical Movement since its purpose is the restoration of a more active participation by the laity in the worship of the Church, and its influence has been felt very considerably outside the Roman Communion in which it arose, alike in Britain and on the Continent. No mention, for example, is made of the introduction of Evening Masses as a very notable Catholic innovation, and the drastic revision of the Holy Week rites, both of which are very significant in the context of this book.

Starting from the 'Pre-literate' cults, chiefly in Africa, this opening section is followed by a survey of the religions of India (Hinduism, the Jains, the Sikhs, the Parsis and Theravada [Hinayana] Buddhism), together with Mahayana Buddhism in the Far East, Confucianism and Taoism in China, and Shinto in Japan. Judaism, Islam, and Christianity are then reviewed as the three great monotheistic faiths. The book is addressed in the first instance to the general reader, and it may be described as a popular work in the best sense. Nevertheless, it is a volume which the specialist can and should read with considerable profit and interest filling as it does a gap in the literature in an important aspect of the study of the religions of the world.

E. O. JAMES

### DISCIPLESHIP

Canon Bryan Green's *Saints Alive!* (Epworth Press [Wyvern Books]; 2s. 6d. net) is as vigorous



as its title. What it gives is not (as in Father Martindale's 'What Are Saints?') a series of brief biographies of outstanding men and women of God, but a straightforward account of what Christian discipleship involves in the modern world. 'Thoughtful people', writes the author, 'have a right to be told what is implied in the demands of Christian discipleship before they are asked to make their surrender to Christ'. But it would be a mistake on that account to regard this book as addressed only to beginners in the life of the Spirit. Believers and church members of many years' standing will find much here to ponder, and much that will interpret the difficulties and the discoveries of the Christian way.

As an evangelist the Rector of Birmingham has been eminently successful in the deepest and truest sense, both in his own parishes and in the missions he has conducted in many parts of the world: the secret of that effectiveness is here in this modest volume. For here is solid teaching on the nature of the Christian life—its discipline and spontaneity, its assurance and humility, its inner peace and divine discontent.

The author is forthright in his criticisms. 'It is possible to have an efficiently organized church which is not spiritual, but it should not be possible to have a spiritual church which is not efficient.' A student who neglects his studies to help with religious meetings is failing in an essential discipline: his true Christian work is to pass his examinations. On the other hand, to claim to love the Lord and yet never to do anything about trying to bring others to Him 'is a sin, a plain, downright sin, for it is a betrayal of Christ'.

I have seen Canon Green hold a student audience enthralled by a simple yet profound exposition of justification by faith. In this book the same doctrinal interest is present throughout, but it is nowhere obtruded, and the practical issues are paramount: about these the author writes with an engaging candour and realism, bringing in many telling illustrations from his own work as pastor and missionary. Efficiency, understanding, willingness to suffer, gentleness, creative power—these are typical qualities he singles out as marking Christian discipleship in the modern world. Life in Christ, it is shown, is a life of fellowship and freedom, of moral struggle and discovery and humility. Many will thank Canon Green for giving in these pages a picture of Christian commitment at once challenging and exhilarating.

JAMES S. STEWART

### THINKING THROUGH THE CREED

Two recent books begin from the proposition that 'The Creed must continually be re-inter-

preted'. Both seek to do this for young men, and those, who have the task of explaining the Apostles' Creed to young people or supplying them with literature on it, should examine these books.

*Thinking Through the Creed*, by Hugh Burnaby (Hodder and Stoughton; 4s. 6d. net) is based on addresses on the Creed given to undergraduates. Hugh Burnaby was Fellow and Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, for more than thirty years, and an Introductory Memoir by the Master of Emmanuel gives a delightful picture of Burnaby himself and of the witness in life which reinforced his addresses. Generally, a short instruction is given for a single clause of the Creed but some of the later clauses are treated in two or three. This allows a more extensive treatment, and shows at its best in the section on the Holy Spirit. Burnaby never preaches but always teaches, and by scholarly analysis and apt Biblical quotation seeks to search out 'the spiritual reality, to which the literal statement points'. His method, as he intended, is an invitation to thought from his hearers. Young people could read this without feeling that they were being 'got at', and stumbling-blocks might be taken from their way.

*The Apostles' Creed: Some Letters of a Methodist Godfather*, by Donald Hughes of Rydal School (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), purports to be a correspondence about the Creed between a school-boy of seventeen (Anglican) and his godfather (Methodist). The boy writes that 'young people in the modern age really need to have the Creed stated in terms that they can understand'. Godfather's replies are intended to do just this. The correspondence method makes for an informal approach, and the author uses it to make some interesting experiments in treating clauses together. Perhaps the most successful letter is that in which he sets beside one another for purposes of explanation the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection. The writer has a gift for modern and telling illustrations, and this may help some to think his thoughts after him in their own instruction. At the end there is an attempt to paraphrase the Creed in modern terms, and beside it, for comparison, an amusing 'Alternative Creed for Today'.

JOHN GRAY

### THE ENGLISH REFORMERS

It has long been part of the Anglo-Catholic case that the English Reformers reacted with excessive, though understandable, violence not against the traditional Catholic doctrine of the Mass but against abuses produced or encouraged by late mediæval errors in doctrine. This carries with it



an interpretation of the English Reformation which plays down its Protestant character. It has also a vital bearing on the continuing controversy over the Roman rejection of Anglican orders. Is it, however, historically valid? Did these alleged errors of doctrine exist? What was taught and believed about the eucharistic sacrifice in the late mediæval period? Why did the Continental Reformers repudiate the Mass? How far did the English Reformers share their opinions and embody them in Anglican formularies? These are questions which are answered in *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, by the Rev. Francis Clark, S.J., D.D. (Darton, Longman and Todd; 50s. net).

This is a large well-documented book, with extensive appendices, bibliography and index, yet for all its learning easy to read. The author's conclusion is that, while there were practical abuses and popular superstitions connected with the altar, the grievous errors in doctrine alleged are either misunderstandings or misrepresentations. The English Reformers, like the Continental ones, knew what they were attacking, and the reasons for their repudiation of the Mass issued from their doctrines of grace, justification, atonement and the Church which involve a basic difference of interpretation of the Christian revelation. This important work makes a real contribution which will have to be taken account of by theologians of every church and school of churchmanship.

STEWART MECHIE

### THE HEALING MINISTRY

A most significant book, indeed it might be said that it is one for which the Church has been waiting, has been written by the Rev. Bernard Martin on *The Healing Ministry of the Church* (Lutterworth Press; 15s. net). It is clear, comprehensive, Biblical, and seeks to answer the vital questions that were raised by the recent Commission on Healing.

Pastor Martin begins by a study of the healing ministry of Christ, the disciples, and the Early Church, showing that the injunction of Jesus to preach the gospel and to heal were two aspects of the same command. The healing was a manifestation of the Kingdom, and was accepted and practised as such.

Pastor Martin goes on to deal with the possibility of implementing that command in the Church to-day. He deals with the area of healing that has been taken over by the science of medicine, but argues that there is still a large field in which spiritual factors play a vital part; a fact that medical science is increasingly recognizing. Chapters five and six deal with the relation of sin

and sickness and the value of sickness. The author pleads that sickness is an evil that must be resisted, and that it is not the will of God, who wills that we should be whole, and that physical and mental healing are signs of redemption.

The author then makes the plea that the Church should undertake the ministry of healing. It is not enough to leave it to certain specially endowed individuals that were mentioned by St. Paul and have emerged at every age since then. It should be safeguarded from any possibility of abuse or misunderstanding by being exercised by the Church in an atmosphere of prayer and concern. Pastor Martin then deals with practical ways and means of carrying on this ministry, which are founded on the New Testament and confirmed in his own experience in this field.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in the book deals with 'Failures'. It honestly seeks an answer to the questions that are bound to arise in the mind of any one who seriously contemplates the matter, questions indeed that do much to make many churchmen afraid to meddle in this ministry. For example we have the problems, 'Why are not all sick folk healed?', 'What about death?', 'What about St. Paul's thorn in the flesh?'

The author's plea is summed up in four sentences. 'The command is precise, Go forth, preach and heal the sick. Pray for one another that ye may be healed. Obedience to this command knows no exception. The Christian quest for healing does not consist in a direct attack on sickness, but rather in a quest for a new and real communion with God.'

Apart from an occasional tendency to stretch the exegesis of a text, this book is a painstaking study of the subject, an honest attempt to meet the issues raised, and a clear challenge to the Church at a time when psycho-somatic illness is increasingly prevalent.

W. H. ROGAN

### THE FAMILY CHURCH

The decline in Sunday School attendance is something of which all branches of the Church are painfully aware. Recent statistical surveys have proved it, and there has been much argument about it. The diagnosis is plain; is there a cure? One answer has come our way in a little book which first appeared in 1941 and is now in its third edition. It is *The Family Church: In Principle and Practice*, by the Rev. H. A. Hamilton (Religious Education Press; 3s. net). The author pioneered his ideas in Congregational circles, and they are now being gladly taken up by other denominations.

Christian education is much more than 'telling



children what we think they ought to know'. It must seek to present the fact of Jesus Christ and the Faith about Him in such a way as to secure the assent of the whole personality. True religion is first learned in the mutual acceptance and service of a Christian home, and when the Church plays its part it must be *in loco parentis*. Good parents begin to make a home before ever children are given to them. They do not wait until their family are almost grown up. Nor must the Church. The time to begin is when babies are brought to be baptized or dedicated, when Church members are not merely benevolent witnesses, but are accepting with the parents the responsibility of bringing up the child in the ways of the Church of God. Here the author gives us wise and practical help in how to see to it that the Church keeps in close touch with the children whom it sponsors. He then goes on to show how family worship can be made real to young people. In most churches boys and girls are huddled together in the front pews, their participation limited to a children's hymn and a moralizing address. Mr. Hamilton moves far beyond this pathetic situation and suggests how to link the great facts of the Christian faith with the great festivals of the Church.

This book is radical, and it is right. Every minister and church leader should possess it and read it. Best of all, it should be discussed chapter by chapter in church groups and then courageously tried out. An appended report from a minister who has made the experiment rightly declares: 'The family church is not a system to be imposed: it is a vision to be interpreted in the needs of the local situation. It is not just a new way of dealing with children . . . it is something fundamental which happens to the whole Church, in all its life.'

DONALD M. MCFARLAN

*Studies in the Middle Way*, by Mr. Christmas Humphreys (Allen and Unwin; 15s. net), and *Buddha's Words of Wisdom*, compiled by Mr. G. F. Allen (Allen and Unwin; 10s. 6d. net).

The first of these books is by a well-known writer on Buddhism and—originally published in 1940—has reached the distinction of a third edition. It is worthy of its long life and of its re-appearance. It does not break new ground but interprets the rather frequent negations of ordinary Buddhistic teaching. It lays all stress on 'Becoming' and abhors the static and the conventional. The emphasis on ethics is slight and the distinction between sorrow and evil is not very marked. The prevailing aim of life is to rise from the self to the Self, and rather too much is made to depend on the distinction between the small and the capital letter. Devotion

to Life rather than Form is all important, and there must be no reliance upon Scripture or ritual or any dependence upon the help of an extra-cosmic God. But the attainment of the goal of 'becoming what you really are' by constant onward movement brings peace and an indescribable sense of unity with the All. The Self revealed by the tranquil integration of all experience is the essence of the Enlightenment which came originally to Gautama and is still regarded as possible for those who accept his teaching.

The second book is the Buddhist form of the work of those who in Christian circles in earlier decades compiled such books as 'Daily Light', with guiding texts for every day of the year. The quality of the three hundred and sixty-five quotations given here in the Buddhist manual is very varied. Some of the daily mottoes are beautiful in the highest sense, but others are trifling and commonplace and occasionally even repellent. One is constantly aware of the need of a positive as well as a negative background for religious counselling.

The *Diary of Andrew Bonar*, first published in 1893, has just been issued by the Banner of Truth Trust in attractive hard boards at 12s. 6d. net, and as a paper-back at 2s. 6d. net.

Another paper-back just published by this firm is *Letters of John Newton* (2s. 6d. net).

Two prominent Baptist ministers have collaborated in compiling *Orders and Prayers for Church Worship* (Carey-Kingsgate Press; 12s. 6d. net). Intended primarily for Baptist ministers, this manual could prove of value to many others. The material for ordinary public worship and for special occasions is well chosen; and a notable feature of the book is a section entitled 'The Ministry of Visitation', which provides readings and prayers for the normal life of the family and for special events and difficulties, including an order for the laying of hands upon the sick. The compilers are Dr. Ernest A. Payne and the Rev. Stephen F. Winward.

The Church Book Room Press has sent us another booklet in its 'Modern Heresies' series—*Mormonism*, by the Rev. M. C. Burrell, B.A. (1s. net). It is suitable for putting into the hands of any who are impressed by Mormon agents. Unlike many sects the Mormons do not claim to base their teachings solely on the Bible. It is not surprising, therefore, that they deny or pervert several vital Biblical doctrines. The author shows convincingly that neither the character of Joseph Smith nor the substance of the Mormon scriptures gives any ground for the belief that Mormonism is a superior revelation.



*The Power of Nonviolence*, by Richard B. Gregg (James Clarke; 6s. net) is a further revision of a book first published in 1934 and revised ten years later. The author cites modern examples of nonviolent resistance, then proceeds to explain how and why it works and concludes with chapters about the requisite training for this method of persuasion and of gaining power which will probably be increasingly used in time to come.

Messrs. James Clarke and Co. have sent us a volume of sermons by Elton Trueblood, an American Quaker philosopher, which they have published in this country at 12s. 6d. net. We note that some of the addresses printed here were originally delivered in College chapels. They show a grasp of Christian truth, a contemporary relevance and a freshness of presentation which should stimulate other preachers as well as appeal to ordinary readers. The title is *The Yoke of Christ*. There is a misprint on p. 33.

*St. John the Baptist and the Kingdom of Heaven*, by G. C. Darton (Darton, Longman and Todd; 6s. 6d. net), is a short paper-bound book of only seventy-five pages, but it is an extremely penetrating study of one of the greatest figures in the New Testament.

The way in which the Gospel writers begin their stories makes it clear that to them John was a figure who in the telling of the story of Jesus could not be left out. It was four hundred years since the voice of prophecy had spoken to Israel; it was, therefore, centuries since any man had seen a prophet. But 'John was as recognizably a prophet as a man in armour is recognizably a knight even to us, centuries after any man has seen knights in armour'. But John was more than a prophet. It may be said of the prophets that their work was 'the perceiving of principles', for instance, that, 'It is the nature of God that he does not want burnt-offerings'. 'It is the nature of God that justice and selfish meanness make him angry.' But John was more than a prophet, because he did not speak only about God *being* something, but also of God being about to *do* something. His task was to shake the nation into awareness of 'the unique irruption' which was upon it.

Unquestionably something of the first importance happened at the baptism of Jesus by John. 'Something released the bowstring at that meeting.' What happened may well have been this. The ministry and the passion of Jesus had, as God works, to wait 'until humanity recognized God and invited him to be active'. In John the faith of Israel recognized and invited God to be

active, and this 'triggered into action' the grace which God was waiting to give in Christ.

In spite of his greatness John was less than the least in the Kingdom of Heaven. That is because he still did not know what the Kingdom really is. 'He still thinks that he will shame and frighten and jostle the people into heaven.' 'John simply assumes that the Kingdom will be made by morals; it is not until St. Paul that morals are made by the Kingdom.' In other words the baptism of John could make a man repent; it took the baptism of Christ not only to make a man repent but also to empower him with the Spirit.

There are many far larger books on John the Baptist which say much less than this little book does. It is a study of John based on real insight.

The first volume of Dr. William Barclay's new studies in the life of Christ, reviewed fully in January, has been followed quickly by the second. *Crucified and Crowned* (S.C.M.; 5s. net) takes up the story after the Transfiguration and brings it to the Ascension. The concluding chapter 'Jesus is Lord' is the setting for such a discussion of the Virgin Birth as is likely to help many troubled minds. Here, as throughout, are the qualities of reverence, understanding, and lucidity which have made Dr. Barclay so notable an expositor. We can all be grateful also to the S.C.M. Press which offers so much (a hundred and ninety-two pages) at so low a cost.

Dr. J. N. Birdsall's *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John* ('The Tyndale New Testament Lecture', 1958; Tyndale Press; 1s. 6d. net) is addressed not to a popular audience but to those who have some technical knowledge of textual criticism. Dr. Birdsall rightly emphasises that the present task of criticism is not to apply Hort's terminology to a period earlier than that for which Hort had evidence, but to attack the new second and third century material by new methods.

Messrs. Whitcombe and Tombs of Christchurch, New Zealand, have sent us a little book which they have published at 7s. 6d. net. It is *Approach with Joy*, by the Rev. Martin Sullivan, Dean of Christchurch. It is a manual for young Anglicans. The contents include Some Prayers to Say and Learn, Graces before Meat, An Order of Family Service, A Catechism with Explanations, The Nicene Creed, and a selection of Canticles, Psalms, and Hymns. There is also a glossary of familiar ecclesiastical words and a chart of the Christian Year, making in all a useful and handy book.



# Some Problems of New Testament Translation<sup>1</sup>

By PROFESSOR C. H. DODD, M.A., D.D., D.THEOL., F.B.A., OXFORD

THE first axiom of the art of translation is that there is no such thing as an exact equivalence of meaning between words in different languages. The illusion that there is such equivalence is quickly shed by anyone who has seriously tackled the task. A word is a pointer to a whole area of meaning, enriched, extended, and complicated by associations and suggestions which depend on particular ways of thought, historical experiences, and social conditions, and a host of factors which do not easily pass the frontier between languages. I shall try here to illustrate and exemplify some of the problems that arise in consequence for the translator of the New Testament.

## 1. Words in their Social Context

(1) It would seem that there is no word easier to translate than the Greek word *δοῦλος*. Everyone knows what it means, and since the obsolescence of the synonyms 'bondman', 'bond-servant', the obvious English equivalent is 'slave'. That term, by the way, occurs only once in the A.V. of the New Testament (Rev 18<sup>13</sup>) and then not as a rendering of *δοῦλος*, which is normally 'servant'. Should we then render *δοῦλος* consistently by 'slave'? I think not. When an English speaker uses the word he has behind him *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and Abraham Lincoln, and Wilberforce and the emancipation movement, and the century-long growth of a now almost universal reprobation of slavery as an institution. He may be thinking of none of these things, but they have imprinted an indelible colouring on the word he uses, 'slave'. There is no tinge of moral reprobation about the Greek word *δοῦλος*, which stands simply for a certain recognized social status. Consequently, in many places the use of the term 'slave' would have misleading overtones for the English reader. It seems better in such places to render (with the A.V.) 'servant', even though this word has

sometimes to represent other words, *οἰκέτης* and *διάκονος*. Yet there are places where the reference to the legal status of slavery is essential to the argument, for example, 1 Co 7<sup>21-22</sup>. Here we are bound to translate: 'Were you a *slave* when you were called? Do not let that trouble you; but if a chance of liberty should come, take it. For the man who as a slave received the call to be a Christian is the Lord's freedman, and, equally, the free man who received the call is a slave in the service of Christ.' Again, in Mt 20<sup>26-27</sup> we have a parallelism with a climax: *διάκονος-δοῦλος*. *Διάκονος* must be 'servant', the A.V. 'minister' being no longer available (a 'minister' is now a member either of a government or embassy, or of the clergy of a non-episcopal church). Yet to say 'whoever would be first must be everybody's slave' would almost inevitably evoke the wrong 'feel' in an English reader. We have rendered, 'Whoever wants to be great must be your servant, and whoever would be first must be the *willing slave* of all'. And there are passages where the metaphor of *δουλεία-ἐλευθερία* would lose its force if we did not keep the antithesis, 'slavery'-'freedom'. Of this I shall have more to say presently.

(2) Consider again the term *ληστής*. King James's translators seem to have been unable to distinguish between *ληστής* and *κλέπτης*, but the words in fact have widely different meanings, even though both may be used of a person who improperly takes possession of what does not belong to him. But the verb *κλέπτειν* stands for something stealthy, furtive (from Latin *fur*); it may mean 'to cheat', or merely 'to disguise, conceal'. The *κλέπτης* comes secretly, unexpectedly, at night (Mt 24<sup>43</sup>, 1 Th 5<sup>2</sup>, Rev 3<sup>3</sup>). The English 'thief' is a fair equivalent, though the thief who 'breaks in' (Mt 6<sup>19</sup>) is more often called a 'burglar'. *Ληστής*, on the other hand, always has a suggestion of violence: *ληΐσθαι* is 'to plunder, despoil', especially by raids or forays (Liddell and Scott); *ληστεία* is 'robbery', or, in a maritime context, 'piracy'. The miscreants who attacked the unfortunate traveller on the Jericho Road were *λησταί*, not 'thieves', but highway 'robbers' (Lk 10<sup>30</sup>). The Temple was not a 'den of thieves' (as it were a 'Fagin's kitchen', as one of our critics naïvely suggested, showing how completely he had been misled by the A.V.). It is compared to a cave in which robbers have found a stronghold from which to terrorize the neighbourhood. The

<sup>1</sup> The publication of *The New English Bible* (New Testament) on 14th March 1961 has brought the subject of translating the N.T. before a very wide public. We are glad to be able to publish this article by Professor Dodd who is Director of the whole enterprise, and himself a member of the N.T. panel of translators, and who in the article discusses some of the problems which the translators had to face.—*Editor.*



readers are not stigmatized as 'thieves'; they are not being accused of giving short change or profiteering in pigeons; the expression *σπήλαιον ἡστών* is a *Bildwort*; it is a strong metaphor pillorying the whole attitude which lay behind his exploitation of the Temple (the words are of course an echo of Jer 7<sup>11</sup>, where *יִצְרָף* also connotes violence, with no suggestion of 'thieving'). In some places the A.V. does render *ληστής*, 'robber' (e.g. 2 Co 11<sup>26</sup>). 'Barabbas was a robber' (Jn 18<sup>40</sup>). But here perhaps the word does not carry the full meaning of *ληστής* in the context. Barabbas was in prison, not for highway robbery, but for insurrection and murder (Mk 15<sup>7</sup>, Lk 23<sup>19</sup>). We recall that Josephus regularly uses *ληστής* of the gangs of terrorists who infested Judaea during the period when the great rebellion was brewing up. It was a group of *λησταί* who made the last desperate stand against the Roman troops in the Temple in A.D. 70. For governing circles they were *λησταί*, but for the populace they were heroes of the underground resistance. The type is familiar in the twentieth century. That is the kind of person Barabbas was, and that is why the mob clamoured for his release. And the two criminals crucified at Golgotha also were *λησταί*, not 'thieves', as the A.V. weakly calls them (Mk 15<sup>27</sup>). And when Jesus was arrested in the Garden, He protested against being treated as a *ληστής* (Mk 14<sup>48</sup> and par.)—which of course was exactly what they wanted Pilate to believe He was. This one word, properly understood, brings up the whole social and political background of the tragic events of Good Friday. But how should it be rendered so as at least to permit of the two levels of meaning? After much thought, and several experiments, we could do no better than 'bandit', a form which has been applied recently to gentry of this ambiguous character (in my youth they were 'brigands', but that word seems out of favour).

## 2. Metaphors

The transposing of metaphorical expressions from one language to another, with its different set of associations, is sometimes a matter of some delicacy. It is necessary to enquire first whether the metaphor is still alive, for all languages are full of dead metaphors, and to attempt to revive in a different language a metaphor which in the original is already dead may produce a frigid and unnatural effect. Thus, the word *ὑπωπιάζειν*, meaning to give a person a black eye, and in general to bruise, is used with perfect propriety in 1 Co 9<sup>27</sup> in a metaphor from boxing, but in Lk 18<sup>5</sup> the metaphor is clearly dead, and it would be wasted ingenuity to devise a translation

which should carry any suggestion of the complainant 'bruising' the judge. All that is meant is 'I will see her righted before she wears me out with her persistence'.

(1) The passage just referred to in 1 Co 9 provides an interesting study. There is a whole string of references to sport in which the metaphors are clearly alive: *ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες, βραβεῖον, ἀγωνιζόμενος, ἐγκρατεύεται, στέφανον, πυκτεύω, ὑπωπιάζω*. They all lend themselves to direct translation into English terms associated with sport. But with *δουλαγωγῶ* we have left the sphere of sport, for a victorious boxer does not lead his defeated opponent into slavery. Here the metaphorical element is considerably weakened, though it has not disappeared: we have rendered 'I bruise my own body and make it know its master'. But how much farther does the series of metaphors extend? *Κηρύσσειν* is used in the language of sport, meaning the formal proclamation of the victor, and also, it appears, the proclamation of the qualifications required of candidates (see Field, *ad loc.* following Wetstein, who cites Chrysostom). The term *ἀδόκιμος* would have been quite appropriate as a description of those who proved not to possess those qualifications, though I do not know of any instance where it is in fact so used. Then is Paul carrying on his series of metaphors from sport? Does he mean, 'lest having laid down for others the necessary qualifications for the Christian *ἀγών*, I should prove to be disqualified myself'? If so, there is a violent shift of imagery: down to . . . *ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ* (if the last word does indeed belong to the series) Paul pictures himself as a competitor: he is the runner who trains severely, and runs to win; he is the boxer who bruises his adversary; he now becomes the *κῆρυξ*, and then again the disqualified competitor. This is surely too confusing, and in any case Paul's rôle as a Christian missionary is not really parallel to that of the *κῆρυξ* in the games. It appears that having, with the word *δουλαγωγῶ*, broken the series of metaphors from sport he does not return to them but uses *κηρύσσειν* and *ἀδόκιμος* in their well-established senses of the proclamation of the gospel and of rejection by God.

(2) The word *ἀγωνιζόμενος* deserves some further consideration. It is here used in its proper sense of a competitor in the games, an 'athlete', as we have rendered it. *Ἀγών* is in the first place an assembly for athletic sports, and then it is an athletic 'event' (as we say)—chariot-race, boxing match, or what not. Only secondarily, and by a natural transference, it is a fight against an opponent. In Heb 12<sup>1</sup>, *τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἀγῶνα*, it is used with strict propriety, with the foot-race in view: we render, 'let us run the



race for which we are entered', using the established English terms. Similarly in 2 Ti 4<sup>7</sup> ἀγών is not a 'fight' (as A.V. has it), but an athletic contest, and here again it is the foot-race that is in view, as the following clause shows: τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα. We render 'I have run the great race, I have finished the course'. And it is fair to assume that in 1 Ti 6<sup>12</sup> the same sense is intended: 'run the great race' (not, of course, that ἀγών means 'race', but that we have no convenient term in English covering every kind of athletic event, and must translate according to the context). The essential idea which the metaphor is intended to enforce is not that of a fight against an opponent, but of the intense effort required of the athlete. In 1 Th 2<sup>2</sup> the A.V., rendering ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι 'with much contention', suggests that Paul's preaching at Thessalonica was 'contentious', or polemical. Possibly it was, but that is not what he is saying. He means it required intense and concentrated effort to get the gospel across to such a public: 'a hard struggle it was'. Similarly the verb ἀγωνίζεσθαι normally connotes strenuous effort rather than hostile action; ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας (Lk 13<sup>24</sup>) is not an encouragement to fight for a place in the queue, but a reminder of the sustained effort (the verb has the continuous *Aktionsart*) demanded of those who are to find entrance. And so Paul uses it in Col 1<sup>29</sup>, κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος, 'I am toiling strenuously'; 4<sup>12</sup>, πάντοτε ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, 'he prays hard for you all the time'. In Jn 18<sup>36</sup>, however, the verb is used in its secondary sense of fighting.

(3) In 2 Ti 2<sup>15-21</sup> we have a whole string of different metaphors, several of which are unquestionably alive: the gangrene which spreads infection (v. 17) (King James's translators were apparently not aware that νομή is a medical technical term for a spreading infection, amply illustrated by Wetstein, *ad loc*); the foundation stone with its inscription (v. 19); the furnishings of a great house (v. 20). What about ὀρθοτομοῦντα (v. 15). It is a somewhat rare word, meaning 'to cut straight', and it might be used of a mason squaring a stone or of a ploughman driving a straight furrow. The latter would give here the excellent sense, 'be straightforward in declaring the truth'—there must be no shilly-shallying. Then should we translate so, assuming that the metaphor is dead? Probably not; for in any case the word ἐργάτης suggests that the writer is speaking figuratively. An ἐργάτης is a labourer; the word is not applicable, literally, to a Christian teacher, but it might well denote either a mason or a ploughman. It therefore prepares the reader for a continuation of the metaphor. Besides, the

author, crowding metaphorical expressions one upon another in this passage, is clearly aiming at picturesque writing, and we should do him less than justice if we eliminated details that help to evoke a picture. We translate therefore, 'driving a straight furrow in your proclamation of the truth'. (The A.V. 'rightly dividing the word of truth', besides mistranslating ὀρθοτομεῖν, which does not mean 'to divide rightly' but 'to cut straight', has produced a clause which appears to me as nearly as possible meaningless, in spite of many ingenious expositions which I have heard or read.)

In v. 18 we have a further expression which is *prima facie* metaphorical, ἡστοχῆσαν. The verb ἡστοχεῖν properly means 'to miss the target' (στόχος). King James's translators have taken the view that the metaphor is no longer alive, rendering 'have erred concerning the truth'. They may be right; the verb is frequently used in Greek writers without any apparent intention to press the metaphor. But in a highly metaphorical context like this we have preferred to render 'have shot wide of the truth', preserving one more picturesque touch, probably in accordance with the author's intention. (If he simply meant to say 'they have erred', he could have said ἐπλανήθησαν, cf. 2 Ti 3<sup>13</sup>, Tit 3<sup>3</sup>.)

(4) We may here consider the use of the metaphors of slavery and freedom which are used so freely, especially by Paul, to express one aspect of what Christ effects for men. That the metaphors are thoroughly alive appears from the way in which the vocabulary appropriate to the slave market is consistently employed: δοῦλος, δουλεία, δουλοῦν, ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερία, ἐλευθεροῦν, πιπράσκειν, ἀγοράζειν, ἀπολύτρωσις. As I have already observed, in the context of these metaphorical expressions we are bound to use the terms 'slave', 'slavery', in order to bring out the full meaning, and for the most part the finding of appropriate English equivalents presents no great difficulty. The one term which needs careful consideration is ἀπολύτρωσις. The word means the manumission of a slave on the payment of a sum of money. 'Redemption' is a correct rendering. But the terms 'redeem' and 'redemption' are no longer in familiar use in this sense; we speak of the 'redemption' of mortgaged property, or the 'redemption' of a pledge or promise, but apart from such uses as this, it seems safe to assume that for most English readers the words have become technical terms of theology, and no more, having lost all the value of their original realistic reference to common experience. 'Redemption' has in fact ceased to be a metaphor; it is worth while to seek for a word which will restore something of the metaphorical content of ἀπολύτρωσις.



In one place, indeed, Eph 1<sup>14</sup>, we have ventured to retain 'redeem', because in the phrase ἀπολύτρωσις τῆς περιποιήσεως the metaphor is from the recovery of *property*, and in this sense the word 'redeem' is thoroughly current. In seeking appropriate renderings elsewhere we have had regard to the facts (a) that the essential content of the term ἀπολύτρωσις is the change of status from slavery to freedom, rather than the transfer of money (in an inscription of Cos referring to sacral manumission ἀπολύτρωσις and ἀπελευθέρωσις are used as exact synonyms; see Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 278, n. 2), and (b) that a large part of the background of the New Testament use of the term is provided by Old Testament ideas about the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, regarded as emancipation from slavery, without any particular suggestion of a price paid for liberty. When a nation gains its liberty we speak of 'liberation'—a word now common on our tongues. So in Lk 24<sup>21</sup> we have rendered λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, 'liberate Israel', and ἀπολύτρωσις, in theological contexts, 'liberation' or 'release', or we have given the sentence a slightly different form in which the verb 'set free' expresses the idea (Ro 8<sup>23</sup>, 1 Co 1<sup>30</sup>). Although one element in the picture (and that a subordinate one) is lost, namely the payment of a price, we believe that we may have restored to life a metaphor which for most readers is dead in the English versions, though it is very much alive in the Greek.

### 3. Words of Multiple Meaning

The maxim that there is no exact equivalence of words in different languages is specially relevant where a single word (Greek or English) has several meanings.

(1) Take for example a word which even King James's translators found it necessary to render in seventeen different ways: καταργεῖν. It means, simply, 'to render ἀργός (α-εργος)' which is either 'not working', 'idle', 'inoperative', or 'not worked' (as of land 'uncultivated', 'fallow'). The two meanings tend to run together. The 'unworked' land is also 'unworking', 'unproductive'. A barren tree draws goodness from the soil to no effect, and puts the ground out of other use; it 'uses up the soil', τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ (Lk 13<sup>7</sup>). This is the only occurrence of the word in the Gospels. Otherwise it is confined to the Pauline corpus, apart from one place in Hebrews (2<sup>14</sup>). In Romans and the Corinthian correspondence Paul uses it to excess, and in a great variety of connexions. Where the object of the verb is νόμος, διαθήκη, the sense 'to render inoperative', 'to invalidate', 'to annul' is in place, and somewhat similarly with πίστις (Ro 3<sup>8</sup>) and ἐπαγγελία

(Ro 4<sup>14</sup>). No one rendering seemed possible throughout, but with this general idea various translations have been adopted which seemed suitable to particular contexts. It is, however, not so easy where the object of the verb is quasi-personal. In 1 Co 15<sup>24</sup>, Christ will at the end καταργεῖν πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν, among them Death, personified as an 'enemy'. In 2 Ti 1<sup>10</sup>, καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν, the rendering 'broken the power of death' would seem to be adequate (and so perhaps in Heb 2<sup>14</sup>). This is what Christ has already accomplished διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. But in 1 Co 15 *loc cit.* we are reading about the final consummation, and death, with all other hostile powers, is henceforward out of the picture altogether: they are 'abolished'—for that seems the most appropriate word here. Even now they are on the way to abolition, καταργούμενοι, 'declining to their end' (1 Co 2<sup>8</sup>). In one place, 2 Th 2<sup>8</sup>, the verb connotes actual destruction or annihilation, since καταργήσει stands here in parallelism with ἀνελεῖ—the reference is to the ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας. But the word does not, in itself, mean 'to destroy'; that sense is given to it by the context: that which is καταργημένον is not necessarily destroyed, though it may be: but it is no longer actual, no longer any part of the universe of things with which one has to reckon—ἀργός in a very absolute sense. Again, as in some contexts the word is given a connotation stronger than that which originally belongs to it, so in other contexts it has an essentially milder meaning. When Paul says of prophecies, and of knowledge, καταργηθήσονται, καταργηθήσεται, he is indicating that there will no longer be any need, or any use, for such things, since they are only partial, and when wholeness comes, τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται, 'the partial vanishes' (1 Co 13<sup>8-10</sup>). But when he goes on to say, κατήργηκα τὰ τοῦ νηπίου (*ib.* 11) he is using the word in a markedly reduced sense, for all that he means is that he has 'finished with' childish things. There remains no doubt a faint suggestion that childish conceptions and impulses no longer have *power* or *effect* with him, but this is little more than a background echo. And when the word is used of the fading of the radiance in the face of Moses (2 Co 3<sup>7</sup>) scarcely any of its original force makes itself felt.

(2) A notable instance where different meanings inherent in a single Greek word demand entirely different words in English, according to the context, is the baffling term πνεῦμα. Its original sense, ἀήρ κινούμενος (the standard definition in Greek writers) bifurcates into the meanings 'wind' and 'breath'; and the latter, on the basis of a naïve psychology, comes to have the



sense which we conventionally represent by 'spirit,' as the non-material element in human nature; and then also as an analogous aspect of the Divine; and here the other kind of ἀήρ κινούμενος comes again into the picture, for the wind is a natural symbol of divine power, and in a more sophisticated metaphysic πνεῦμα is the 'living and thinking gas' which pervades the universe and may be called 'God': a fine complication of meanings! We are disposed to say, πνεῦμα means (a) breath, (b) wind, (c) spirit. But it is pretty certain that the Greek who said πνεῦμα did not keep them as neatly separated as that; else John would not have been able to say, το πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ . . . οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνευματος (3<sup>8</sup>). We have no alternative but to render 'wind' in the first clause and 'spirit' in the second, but we have lost something in doing so. Nowhere else in the New Testament does πνεῦμα require to be rendered 'wind', but when we read in Ac 2<sup>3-4</sup> that at the sound of a violent πνοή the apostles were filled with πνεῦμα it is evident that the near-identity of the two words stands for a unity of concept which we cannot reproduce in English. Similarly in Jn 20<sup>22</sup>, λάβετε πνεῦμα ὄγιον, although we are bound to translate 'spirit', it is clear that the idea of breath was not absent from the author's mind, since the symbolic or sacramental act by which πνεῦμα is conveyed is the act of breathing—ἐνεφύσησεν. There are two places where πνεῦμα demands to be rendered 'breath': (a) Rev 13<sup>15</sup>, where πνεῦμα is given to the image ἵνα λαλήσῃ, for it is breath that makes speech possible, and (b) Rev 11<sup>11</sup>, where πνεῦμα ζωῆς must surely be 'breath of life', i.e., the power to breathe by which alone life is sustained. But in neither case can we suppose that the author was altogether oblivious of the wider content of the term, which is suggested in English by 'spirit', although to translate 'spirit' would convey a false impression. Elsewhere 'spirit' is the inevitable rendering, though this word is deplorably vague and imprecise, and has developed shades of meaning which are not always helpful to its use in a religious context. Here lies the real difficulty for the 'general reader', and there is not much that the translator can do about it.

(3) In the two instances cited so far the multiple meanings may be accounted for by a fairly logical development out of a single idea. In the word δόξα, on the other hand, we have an instance of meanings originally separate which tend to coalesce because the same word is used for both. The Greek word means 'opinion', 'reputation', and then 'high reputation', 'distinction', 'honour', 'fame'. So in fact does the Latin *gloria* and its English derivative 'glory' ('The

paths of glory lead but to the grave'). In Biblical Greek δόξα was used to translate Hebrew כְּבוֹד, which can bear a similar meaning, but has also (and perhaps primarily) that of 'splendour', applied especially to the visible radiance which was the manifestation of the divine presence. This meaning is entirely alien to the native Greek δόξα. (Kittel seems to have disposed of the alleged popular use of the term for 'Lichtglanz' [*Wörterbuch*, s.v.]). Both meanings are to be recognized in the New Testament. In 1 Co 15<sup>41</sup> Paul speaks of the δόξα of sun, moon, and stars—clearly their luminosity, 'splendour', or 'brightness'; but in 15<sup>44</sup> δόξα is the antithesis of ἀτιμία, which is surely not brightness but honour, or 'glory' in the normal sense. Yet the writer was hardly conscious of moving from one meaning to another; the resurrection body is resplendent as well as honourable; and that, no doubt, is why he has chosen δόξα rather than the more obvious τιμή as the antithesis of ἀτιμία. In Jn 5<sup>41-44</sup> the δόξα which men wrongly seek from one another is clearly 'honour', and so presumably is the δόξα which they should seek from God alone. Yet the thought of the δόξα which is the divine splendour is not far beneath the surface. In Jn 11<sup>4</sup> the death of Lazarus is ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, i.e. it is designed to bring honour, or 'glory' (in the proper sense) to God; but in a sentence which apparently harks back to this (11<sup>40</sup>) the δόξα of God is to be *seen*, and you can't see honour or reputation; clearly it is the divine splendour. Yet we ought not, perhaps, to use different terms in rendering two verses which are so closely related, especially as in v. 4 itself δοξασθῆ carries the characteristically Johannine idea that the Christ who dies and rises again is the true כְּבוֹד or visible manifestation of the invisible God. It seems inevitable that we should use the term 'glory' in both places. In short, it seems desirable wherever possible to distinguish the two senses of δόξα (as Luther's German version distinguishes *Ehre* and *Herrlichkeit*), but there are places where we must be content to accept the word 'glory' in an extended sense, which is apparently the result of its history as a theological term representing the Greek δόξα, but has passed sufficiently into current English of the more elevated kind (cf. observations in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v.).

(4) An analogous but far more involved problem is raised by δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, and allied terms, and here again the matter is complicated by the Hebraic background of Jewish and early Christian religious language. In Greek the Aristotelian definition fairly covers the field: δικαιοσύνη is (a) the virtue of giving every man his due, or



(b) the whole of virtue so far as it is concerned with social relations. 'Justice' is a fair equivalent. Yet we do not usually speak of the good citizen as a 'just' man; we speak of him as 'good' or 'virtuous', and often this is the most natural rendering of *δίκαιος*. *Δικαιοσύνη* accordingly may be 'goodness', or 'virtue', and *δικαιοσύνην ποιεῖν* (1 Jn 3<sup>7</sup>) simply 'to do right'. Yet in Biblical thought ethics depend on religion, and *δικαιοσύνη* is what God demands; and sometimes this side of the meaning needs to be expressed (e.g., Mt 3<sup>15</sup>). Where there is anything of a forensic setting 'just' and 'justice' are in place. It is quite natural to speak of an 'unjust' judge (Lk 18<sup>6</sup>), though we should call a bailiff who cheats his master 'dishonest' rather than 'unjust' (Lk 16<sup>8</sup>). Where the character or action of God is concerned, if it is conceived in terms of divine government or judgment, 'just' and 'justice' may be in place (Ro 3<sup>5</sup>, 1 Jn 1<sup>9</sup>). But here the Hebraic element comes in. *Δικαιοσύνη* is צֶדֶק, צִדְקָה, and this has a wide range of meaning essentially strange to Greek. In particular it means the action of God in triumphantly vindicating the right. And so, the *δικαιοσύνη* for which we are to hunger and thirst is the final triumph of right (Mt 5<sup>6</sup>). This Hebraic concept has deeply coloured the Pauline usage of these terms. The *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* which is revealed in the gospel (Ro 1<sup>17</sup>) is the action which God has taken to overthrow the wrong and vindicate the right: it is 'God's way of righting wrong'. Further, the verb צָדַק carries the meaning 'to be in the right', and צֶדֶק, צִדְקָה connote status as well as character and action—a meaning alien to the Greek *δικαιοσύνη*, which has to serve as equivalent. Nor have we any English term which really corresponds, though more or less clumsy expressions may be invented. Some attempt might be made to paraphrase according to the different contexts in which the words occur; but what are we to do with such a passage as Ro 10<sup>1-6</sup>, where the shades of meaning vary kaleidoscopically? *Δικαιοσύνη*, is at once the norm of right conduct as ordained by God, the divine action to vindicate right, the status of being in the right, or of being acceptable to God. In each of the five clauses (or six if we supply *δικαιοσύνην* with *τὴν ἰδίαν* in v. 3, as we must) one aspect or another may be recognized as most prominent, but it is impossible to exclude other aspects. Any attempt to use different terms would disguise the run of the argument, which is all about *δικαιοσύνη*. It seems we must be content with 'righteousness' as a rendering, though the word is used in a sense which is non-natural in English, outside of a strictly theological context.

This brings us to the verb *δικαιοῦν*, which does not seem to be used in the New Testament in any sense normally attaching to it in (non-Jewish and non-Christian) Greek writers (see *The Bible and the Greeks*, 46-53). It always starts from the Hebrew קִיְיָה, as the causal of קָצַח in the sense of 'to be in the right'. Thus the Wisdom of God is 'proved right' by its results (Mt 11<sup>19</sup>). The lawyer who had been told to obey the commandment to love one's neighbour as oneself wished to put himself in the right, or to 'vindicate' himself (Lk 10<sup>29</sup>). In a forensic setting it means 'to acquit', as in Mt 12<sup>37</sup>, where it stands in antithesis to *καταδικάζειν*. Similarly the penitent publican is 'acquitted' of his sins before the Divine tribunal (Lk 18<sup>14</sup>).

These are simple cases, but in the Pauline epistles the verb becomes the vehicle of more sophisticated theological ideas. For Paul, to be *δεδικαιωμένος* is to have achieved, or to have been granted, an unimpeachable status before the law, whether concrete statute law or some ideal law, 'the law of God'. The normal situation, under a legal system, is that such a status is attained by the due performance of the law's requirements, as in Ro 2<sup>13</sup> the doers of the law *ipso facto* acquire a good standing before God. This is expressed in two ways: *δίκαιοι κατὰ τὸν θεόν*, and *δικαιωθήσονται*, which are clearly here equivalent. Where a person does in fact merit such standing, but his standing is falsely impugned by accusers, the attainment of an unimpeachable status will be his 'vindication'. This is the most usual sense of *δικαιοῦσθαι* in 2 Isaiah, and it is probable that the deutero-Isaianic idea of the 'vindication' of Israel lies in the background of a good deal of Paul's thought. Yet he cannot transfer it directly to the Christian situation, since no man (*ex hypothesi*) deserves a good standing, and consequently every man needs something other than vindication. Only of God (Ro 3<sup>4</sup>) or Christ (1 Ti 3<sup>14</sup>) can *δικαιοῦσθαι* be predicated in the sense 'to be vindicated'.

When a person has charges brought against him, a good standing can be restored only by the verdict of a competent court. Normally, a verdict of acquittal may properly be returned only if it is clear that the charges are false, and that the prisoner is innocent. In that sense, 'acquittal' is equivalent to 'vindication'. But a partial judge may pronounce sentence of acquittal in favour of a prisoner who is in fact guilty. It cannot be said that his character is vindicated, but his standing before the law is now secure, provided only that the court has competence. In the Torah it is expressly forbidden *δικαιοῦν τὸν ἀσεβῆ* (Ex 23<sup>7</sup>). But the Pauline paradox is that this is



precisely what God does : he 'acquits the wicked' (Ro 4<sup>5</sup>). Here 'acquit' seems to be the proper rendering, the sense being truly forensic, and so also in 8<sup>33</sup>, where ὁ δίκαιων stands in antithesis to ὁ κατακρινών, and 1 Co 4<sup>4</sup>, where Paul, being arraigned before an ideal court, believes himself to be innocent, but will not urge his consciousness of innocence to prejudge the issue of the Last Judgment. In the court of conscience he is 'acquitted', but possibly not before God's tribunal. We may perhaps recognize an analogical use in Ro 6<sup>7</sup>, where strictly δικαιώται should mean that death wipes out all scores, so that the dead man's standing before the law cannot be impugned ; but actually it means no more than that no case can be brought against a dead man ; he is 'no longer answerable for his sins'.

In all other passages of Romans, I think, as all through Galatians and in 1 Co 6<sup>11</sup>, we have a peculiarly Pauline usage which is not covered by any of these renderings. Its presupposition is expressed in the citation of the LXX in Ro 3<sup>20</sup>, Gal 2<sup>18</sup>, which states the exact contrary of Ro 2<sup>13</sup> : οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. While under a legal system the doer of the law is *ipso facto* in good standing, upon the higher religious level no man can hold such a standing by merit : he cannot achieve, but must be granted, the desired status. From this point of view we must say that on purely legal terms it is inconceivable that any man whatever can enjoy an unimpeachable status, Gal 3<sup>11</sup>. It seems clear that neither 'acquit' nor 'vindicate' will do in such passages. So far as legal terms are to be used, the man who keeps the law *can* achieve 'acquittal' by merit, and does not need to be granted it ; while if we are to recognize that this is a sphere where strict legalism does not run, then we must say that no man is innocent, and therefore no man can be 'vindicated'.

Here we encounter the specifically Pauline doctrine ; *i.e.*, the doctrine that the desired unimpeachable status is granted *sola gratia* on the basis of faith. In so far as the forensic or juridical metaphor is sustained, 'acquitted' is a fair rendering. Yet at this point it appears an inadequate rendering, for though it accurately

renders the strictly forensic usage in such a passage as Ro 4<sup>5</sup>, our term 'acquit' seems too narrow and specialized to cover Paul's meaning, or indeed the meaning of the Hebrew expressions which are at the back of his mind. 'Acquittal' is essentially a negative idea ; δικαιώσις is a positive one : it is not simply the clearing of a man from charges brought against him, but a positively favourable status, secure against any further accusation (Ro 8<sup>34</sup>). Its consequence is that a man is at peace with God (Ro 5<sup>1</sup>). Yet it must not be identified with reconciliation ; it is the necessary pre-condition of reconciliation, and a condition which can be fulfilled only by act of God. When it is fulfilled, man is set free for a new relationship with God. But δικαιώσις is not itself that new relationship ; it is an objective status before God's law. It is the removal of guilt, but not of the *sense* of guilt : that is subjective, and δικαιώσις is objective. (The *sense* of liberation comes when you 'regard yourselves as dead to sin' [Ro 6<sup>11</sup>], and when the Spirit within cries 'Abba ! Father !' [Gal 4<sup>6</sup>]).

Then how should δικαιοῦν be rendered ? In many places neither 'acquit' nor 'vindicate' will do, for reasons I have given. 'Put in the right' is nearly literal, and might satisfy those who know the Greek, but to the general reader it would convey little meaning—or a wrong meaning. 'Get right with God' again is an unnatural expression, current only in certain special circles, and it is anyhow misleading, since it confuses justification with reconciliation. It seems impossible to find a satisfactory English word which will allow for the various *nuances* of Pauline thought, and it seems necessary to accept 'justify', 'justification', as terms which do indeed belong to current English, but are here used in a sense which is not current, in fact as technical terms which must either explain themselves from the context to the attentive reader, or await the commentator.

In other words, we found the problem set by this group of words insoluble, and must end by confessing failure, at this point, to achieve our aim of rendering the Greek of the New Testament into genuinely current English speech.

## The Primary Stewardship

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS WEBSTER, CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY, LONDON

THERE is general agreement that the present interest in Christian stewardship is one of the most hopeful signs in the Church of England. It is catching on. It has brought new life to many

parishes. It has made sense to the laity. There had been stewardship campaigns before the Lambeth Conference of 1958 but there have been many more since. Undoubtedly Resolution 64 of



that Conference is having its effect on the Church at home. It recalled Church people 'to the duty and privilege of stewardship, of which sacrificial, planned, and systematic giving is a part'. In the Conference Report (ii. 76) stewardship is defined more widely. It 'is the regarding of ourselves and our possessions as a trust from God to be utilized in His service according to His will. A parish without a sense of stewardship has within it the seeds of decay. A man who refuses to be a steward of his time, talents, and money is unworthy of being in the Father's House. Therefore it is primary that all clergy and lay leaders practise and teach stewardship as an integral part of Christian life and worship.'

The triad 'time, talents and money' has become the basis on which stewardship has generally been presented and expounded. This has proved helpful and it has sought to prevent an exclusive emphasis on money. Where Christians have thrown themselves actively and enthusiastically into stewardship campaigns by visiting people in the parish they have sometimes found themselves involved in Christian witness and mission at an unexpectedly deeper level. This can always happen when man meets man and frontiers are crossed. It is at this point that another stewardship has to operate, a stewardship which may well lay claim to being the *primary* stewardship in the New Testament, the stewardship of the gospel.

The purpose of this short note is to suggest that the now familiar triad, 'time, talents and money' does not exhaust the meaning of stewardship but that fundamental to the whole metaphor is the over-riding concern of St. Paul with the stewardship of the gospel. This stewardship underlies all other. For that reason it is worth a little Biblical exploration.

The *locus classicus* for the word 'steward' in the Gospels is Lk 16<sup>1-9</sup>, the story of the 'unjust steward'. The steward (*ὁ οἰκονόμος*) was a man who was responsible for managing and superintending his master's affairs and looking after his interests. He had charge of the accounts and dispensed his master's money, paying bills, wages and allowances. It should be noted that the steward was usually either a freed-man or a slave, that he was in a position of trust, responsibility and authority, but that he himself was under an ultimate authority. At any time he might be required to render an account of his stewardship. The financial side of the steward's duties naturally tends to predominate and in Ro 16<sup>23</sup> Erastus, the City Treasurer, is described as *ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως*. Elsewhere wider responsibilities are implied. In Gal 4<sup>2</sup>, for instance, Paul speaks of a child-heir being under 'guardians and stewards'

(R.V.) *ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους*. The R.S.V. renders this 'guardians and trustees'. The former word *ἐπίτροπος* is translated as steward in Mt 20<sup>8</sup> ('the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward') and Lk 8<sup>3</sup> ('Chuzea Herod's steward'). The idea of trust is embedded in this word also, for the *ἐπίτροπος* is an overseer.

The only other occurrence of 'steward' in the Gospels is Lk 12<sup>42</sup>: 'And the Lord said, Who then is the faithful and wise steward (*οἰκονόμος*), whom his lord shall set over his household, to give them their portion of food in due season? Blessed is that servant (*δοῦλος*), whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing'. The Matthaean version of this saying (Mt 24<sup>45</sup>) has 'servant' for 'steward'. The steward is expected to be both faithful and wise. These are qualities Jesus constantly commended. (The 'unjust steward' was not faithful but he was a model of wisdom.) He is both over and under, over the household, under the lord. The context is eschatological; the steward knows that his lord is coming. Christian stewardship likewise must be regarded in the light of the End. The three great parables in Mt 25 (The Virgins, The Talents, The Sheep and the Goats) all in an eschatological context emphasize that the steward (servant) must use his opportunities and gifts responsibly and fruitfully. The Parable of the Virgins stresses wisdom, the Parable of the Talents stresses faithfulness, the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats shows the importance of responding adequately to people in a great variety of circumstances and situations. Together they explain how to be a faithful and wise steward in a stewardship involving more than money. In all three parables failure in proper stewardship is sloth. Sloth is the opposite and the only alternative to stewardship, and here it is seen to be irresponsibility (The Virgins), unfaithfulness (The Talents) and downright sin (The Sheep and the Goats).

The evidence of the Gospels towards the meaning of stewardship may be summarized in four points: (1) A steward exercises responsibility for his master's affairs and interests. (2) He is in a position of trust, over and under. (3) The qualities he requires are faithfulness and wisdom. (4) He lives and works bearing in mind the coming audit.

With this Gospel background in mind two Pauline passages must be noticed. First: 'This is how one should regard us, as servants (*ὑπηρέτας*) of Christ and stewards (*οἰκονόμους*) of the mysteries of God. Moreover it is required of stewards that they be found trustworthy' (1 Co 4<sup>1,2</sup> [R.S.V.]). The parallelism between servants (ministers R.V.) and stewards is found here also, as is the emphasis on faithfulness. The word *ὑπηρέτης* was originally used for those who row in the lower tier of a



trireme and so came to mean simply 'underlings'. Stewards, however senior and responsible, are always underlings. But here stewardship is associated with the 'mysteries of God'. It is the duty of the Christian ministry to dispense these mysteries, the great truths of God revealed in Jesus Christ, and of course the supreme 'mystery', namely the gospel itself. St. Paul develops this line of thought in the second passage. 'For if I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; for woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel. For if I do this of mine own will, I have a reward: but if not of mine own will, I have a stewardship (*οἰκονομίαν*) intrusted to me' (1 Co 9<sup>16, 17</sup> [R.V.]). Our present purpose is not concerned with the exegetical problem of the reward; the point is that Paul is expressing an inner compulsion to preach the gospel because of his consciousness of a stewardship and a trust. In Paul's thought this is the primary and basic stewardship.

If this New Testament insight were incorporated into the admirable expositions of stewardship which are being given or circulated in the Church to-day much might be gained. It would provide an invaluable link between stewardship and evangelism. It would help the laity still more to understand their mission, which involves witness as well as almsgiving. Without in any way soft-pedalling the significance of money, whether sacramentally or just practically, it would subordinate the stewardship of money, as of time and talents, to the chief Christian stewardship of all, the stewardship of the gospel, being able to offer men the gospel *free of charge*. It is important for the Church to raise money and this has to be done. But this can never be the Church's primary task. When the money has been raised and the annual income of a parish trebled or quadrupled, what then? The laity who have responded so magnificently in one place after another to a 'stewardship campaign', as it has come to be called, and have submitted themselves to training, must be taken on a stage further to understanding the stewardship of the gospel. This too will involve training on a considerable scale. In the spiritual logic of the Kingdom it is the only proper outcome of this present movement which is sweeping through our Church. Stewardship *must* lead to mission, otherwise we are no further on. St. Paul is writing as an apostle and this reference to stewardship arises in a discussion of his apostleship. To-day it is being realized that every Christian is called to take his share in the apostleship of the Church. A memorable paragraph in the *Encyclical Letter* of the 1958 Lambeth Conference underlines this. 'There is a growing recognition to-day that too sharp a distinction has

been made between clergy and laity. All baptized persons have the priestly vocation of offering life as a living sacrifice, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. There is a ministry for every member of Christ; every man and woman who is confirmed is commissioned to this ministry in the Church, the home, the community, the world of business and social life' (i. 26). What is this but the stewardship of the gospel? Timothy is urged to teach 'certain persons' at Ephesus 'not to occupy themselves with myths and endless genealogies which promote speculations' but with 'the divine *training* (*οἰκονομίαν*) that is in faith' (1 Ti 1<sup>4</sup> [R.S.V.]).

With the exception of the designation of a bishop as 'God's steward' in Tit 1<sup>7</sup> there is only one further reference to stewards in the New Testament. 'As each has received a gift (*χάρισμα*), employ it for one another, as good stewards (*οἰκονόμοι*) of God's varied grace' (1 P 4<sup>10</sup> [R.S.V.]). With this we may compare Paul writing to the Ephesians: 'assuming that you have heard of the stewardship (*οἰκονομίαν*) of God's grace that was *given to me for you*' (Eph 3<sup>2</sup> [R.S.V.]) and to the Colossians: 'the church, of which I became a minister according to the divine office (*οἰκονομίαν*) which was *given to me for you*' (Col 1<sup>25</sup> [R.S.V.]). (The only two other uses of *οἰκονομία* in the New Testament do not concern us here. They are Eph 1<sup>10</sup> and 3<sup>9</sup>, translated 'dispensation' in R.V. and 'plan' in R.S.V. In both cases the reference is to the divine 'economy' or arrangement of history in providing for man's salvation.) Different Christians have different gifts to distribute according to their calling. The art of stewardship is in the activity of distribution. Whatever we know of the gospel, whatever we enjoy of God's grace, whatever ministry we have received, is ours in trust for others, 'given to me for you'. It belongs to the

Immortal Love, for ever full,

For ever flowing free,

For ever shared, for ever whole, . . .

Such Christian commerce in the realm of the Spirit is the very life of the Church. 'Trade . . . till I come' is the Lord's charge to His Church, as in the parable (Lk 19<sup>13</sup>). Each member of Christ's Body is a steward of a *charisma*, a grace-gift, coupled to a particular function and ministry given him by God, and subordinate to his stewardship of the gospel. He is called, therefore, to be faithful, to find and take his particular part in the ministry and mission of the Church, to live in the light of the End, and to be a steward of his talents, time and money, *because* the fact of his being a Christian at all makes him a steward both of the gospel and of the magnificently varied grace of God.



# Under-estimated Theological Books

## Frank Weston's 'The One Christ'

BY THE REVEREND CANON H. E. W. TURNER, D.D., VAN MILDERT PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN  
THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

IMPORTANT studies in Christology in the first decade of the present century were hardly plentiful. Yet within a space of two years P. T. Forsyth, the Congregationalist scholar and Frank Weston, later Bishop of Zanzibar, both produced studies which still deserve consideration to-day. They worked independently of each other and yet in many respects they belong together. Both have a secure standard of reference, Forsyth in the evangelical facts, Weston in the classical Patristic Christologies. Yet while Forsyth is justly regarded as a first-class authority in the field, Weston may not have received the acclaim which he deserves.

The aim of the book is to restate the traditional Christology in terms of the current philosophy of the age, of personality and self-consciousness. An acute, though somewhat ruthless critic, Dr. J. S. Lawton in his book, *Conflict in Christology*, while assigning high praise to the book in certain respects, regards the attempt to restate the traditional Christology in modern terms as fundamentally misconceived. Whether Weston is completely successful or not may be a matter of opinion; to disown the attempt in principle would be a counsel of despair.

Weston's Patristic knowledge is, of course, that of his day (relying mainly on Dorner and Ottley) and it is not to be expected that a modern Patristic scholar would find his classification of particular Fathers completely satisfying. Yet the broad lines of his treatment remain convincing. He wisely narrows down his question to a fine point, 'Who is the self-conscious subject of the Incarnate Life?' In this form the question is no doubt a modern one though (questions of terminology apart) there is abundant evidence that in a different form it underlay the Christological conflicts which racked the Church in the fifth century.

One line of solution in the Patristic period finds the subject of the Incarnate life in the unlimited Logos. Of this Weston finds several variants though modern scholars would not accept his classification of particular Fathers in every case. The first variant finds the subject as the unlimited Logos with whom are conjoined as a second nature a human soul and body. At times, however, during the Incarnate life the Logos is quiescent, as though in particular experience He was, as it were,

'switched off'. The problem here is the alternation of states which makes the predication of a common subject difficult, if not impossible. The combination of the Logos unlimited and quiescent within a single sphere of operations is the Achilles heel of this theory. The Gospels themselves give no hint of so radical and sudden a series of changes. The Cyrilline variant abandons any such alternations but, while accepting the common axioms of this view, reduces the status and value of the human experiences. It is virtually kenotic of the full range of our Lord's humanity and is in noticeable trouble over His progress in wisdom and favour with God and man, His trouble of soul and His ignorance of the date of the Parousia. Such a depression of the humanity to the level of 'second-class citizenship' within the Incarnation will not serve our need. The third variant which leads either in ancient or modern times to a fusion of the natures makes the worst of both worlds.

Equally unsatisfactory in Weston's opinion is the opposite tradition in which the unlimited Logos is regarded as conjoined to a complete human being in some kind of godly union and concord. If the crucial question for antiquity may be put in the form 'If the Logos were taken away from the Incarnate Person, what would be left?' this view would reply without hesitation 'a complete man', the *homo assumptus*. To this Weston finds insuperable objections. We are left in difficulties over the provision of a proper subject for the Incarnate life. Is it the assumed man or the Logos conjoined with the man? Such a view assumes that manhood is a thing in itself apart from its God-aided potentialities. He asks whether the subject of our Lord's human experiences must necessarily be a man and whether the conditions would not be adequately met if the humanity were considered as the minimal content of the Incarnation, the limits or measures which the Logos allowed to prevail over Himself during His earthly life. Here Weston might have appealed to a dictum of St. Cyril of which the original author never appears to have realized the full possibilities. At this point Weston approaches most closely to the doctrine of the *Enhyphostasia* of Leontius and St. John of Damascus. The two natures meet in one Person but the unity of Person is not to be regarded as a



*tertium quid* outside the natures themselves making them one. There is a close parallel in the doctrine of the Trinity where the unity is not to be regarded as a fourth element which makes the Three One, but rather the Three being One. If then, the Cyrilline notion of the manhood as a limitative factor is inadequate to the facts of the Gospels, the idea of a double personality or anything approximating to this contains inferences which the facts themselves fail to justify.

Weston next passes under review a group of kenotic theories. These at least have the merit of insisting that the self-limitation of the Son is real and permanent at least as far as the earthly life of our Lord is concerned. He recognises that there is *prima facie* support for such views in the kenosis passage of Ph 2, but rightly notes that the New Testament goes no distance at all to establish the special features of such views. The nerve of his criticism is that, while we can and must speak of self-limitation, we cannot accept the theory of abandonment, whether in the extreme form of the 'cosmic absenteeism' of the theory of Gess or the more moderate distinction between metaphysical and moral attributes made by Fairbairn. For this group of theories kenosis consists primarily in a prior act of will initiating certain results; for Weston it is a standing condition of self-limitation extending throughout the whole Incarnation. Among the Kenoticists proper he stands closest to Martensen. His general criticisms of this group of theories follows what has become the conventional pattern. The real brunt of the doctrine is borne by the immutability of God. The distinction between moral and metaphysical attributes cannot be sustained. The Incarnation of a depotentiated Logos cannot serve our need. The theory of the abandonment of attributes raises the equally difficult problem of their resumption. It may be questioned whether all these objections are equally valid but this would carry us outside what is specific to Weston himself. Two points in his criticism would certainly not command general acceptance. He insists that the Incarnation must be carried beyond the Ascension and therefore 'whatever we postulate of the manner of the incarnate life on earth must bear some relation to the manner of it in Heaven all down the ages'. There may be some truth in this verdict but it is liable to have implications which many would not support. And in his discussion of the relation between our Lord's earthly knowledge (and ignorance) and His omniscience as God even more theologians would prefer to take their stand with Gore rather than with Weston.

At this point Weston turns to a sketch of his own theory, reserving to the last section of the book a comparison with the facts of the Gospels. The

Person who became Incarnate is purely divine. His Incarnation in no way interfered with His true life in the eternal Godhead. This is in line not only with Patristic Christology but with the *extra Calvinisticum* of the Reformed tradition. The kenosis involved in the Incarnation is not an abandonment in whole or in part of the divine attributes but a self-limitation, a law of restraint which applies continuously over the whole field of His Incarnate Being. It even extends to His relation *qua* Incarnate to the Father. This is, for Weston, involved in the statement that He assumed to Himself a human nature with its own proper and complete soul. This human nature cannot be regarded either as a mere conditioning or instrumentation or as the association of a theoretically independent human being with God the Logos; the subject of the manhood is the Logos Himself, but the self-limiting Logos. The Incarnation is both a theophany and anthropophany. It is the first in virtue of the Logos who is its sole and proper subject; it is the second because perfect humanity is not manhood autonomous of God but a manhood which is aided by and dependent upon God. Perhaps the deepest and most distinctive part of Weston's Christology is yet to come. The law of restraint is not, as in many kenotic theories, a prior act of will leading to an alteration in the nature of the Logos through the abandonment of attributes; it lies within the fact of being Incarnate and extends over the whole area of the Incarnate life. Its measure lies in the possibility of humanity at its best to contain and mediate the life of the Logos. This is really the obverse or the reciprocal of the Incarnation considered as an anthropophany and recalls one of the finest insights of St. Irenaeus—'He filled the manhood with as much of the Godhead as it was able to bear'. Words like *capere* and *portare* in St. Irenaeus express the point which Weston was trying to make. But it is also a progressive process. As the humanity itself develops, so its ability to reflect the Logos and to mediate His Godhead increased. Here is a link with Forsyth for whom a *plerosis* of the manhood matched the *kenosis* of the Godhead. Yet, while Forsyth will speak of the retraction of attributes, it is by no means clear that Weston would follow him here. He can, indeed, once speak of this law of restraint (which for him is absolute and continuously applied) as 'putting out of action whatever of divine power the manhood cannot mediate', but in general it is a question of the restriction of the expression or expressibility of that power that is at stake. Like Forsyth Weston illustrates his theory by telling and well-chosen analogies from human life (pp. 151, 154f., 164f.) though he is careful not to claim too much for them. The self-limited Logos, then, never touches life at any point except through the



medium of His humanity. Even His relationship to the Father obeys this law of self-restraint. This strand in his teaching makes it tempting to include Weston among the Kenoticists. Yet, however attune he may appear to be to their fundamental insight into the Incarnation, he rejects completely one of their leading axioms, 'the view of a wall of separation between the Logos in glory and the Logos in manhood'. It seems preferable to regard it as a slightly kenoticised form of the *Enhyposiasis* presented in a less learned but more rounded and contemporary form than Relton's much later *Study in Christology*.

What Weston's doctrine really amounts to is something like this. Without alteration or subtraction the Logos is from eternity to eternity a constituent member of the Holy Trinity. This set of relationships persists. But in Time He becomes incarnate adding to Himself a human nature with a new corresponding set of relationships. The measures of this humanity He allows to prevail over Himself and thus manifests Himself during the Incarnation no longer as the Logos *simpliciter* but as the self-limited Logos. Within the Incarnation itself, again, there are two entities, the Logos and His humanity—the one personal, the other not 'independently represented'. These are not in Weston's view alternates but rather reciprocals. Instead of the ancient theory that the Logos is now active, now quiescent within the One Christ, he suggests a single *modus operandi* in which the Incarnate Logos is always and at all times con-

tained (alike restricted and mediated) by His own humanity. There is a single subject of the Incarnate life, the self-limited Logos, a single self-consciousness, the self-limited Logos acting in and through His humanity, but two sets of relations, the Logos within and outside His Incarnation, and two natures reciprocating within the Incarnate life itself. It might help if we thought of the two sets of relations vertically as forming a kind of acute angle and the two natures horizontally as dovetailing into or reciprocating into each other.

The last part of the book is devoted to an attempt to check his theory against the facts of the Gospels. This is performed reverently and capably, though a modern critical scholar would from time to time want to cross swords with the missionary Bishop in his interpretation of the data.

On the adequacy of this theory as a piece of modern Christology I should not wish here to try to pronounce judgment. No theory can hope to measure itself against the facts and of this Weston is refreshingly aware. Much in Christology depends upon the general standpoint of the theologian himself. It remains a careful, thorough and reverent work of scholarship, eminently readable and still worthy of the consideration even of those who recognise that its technical scholarship is fifty years out-of-date. We have seen that Weston's thought does not pigeon-hole at all easily and those who value independence of mind and judgment combined with careful scholarship will not readily allow this book to go unremembered.

## In the Study

### Virginibus Puerisque

#### Knowing the Way

By H. F. MATHEWS, M.A., PH.D.,  
KIDDERMINSTER

'This is the way': walk ye in it'.—Is 30<sup>21</sup>.

LIKE many other families, I suppose, we have invented a game to while away the tedium of long car journeys. We have a competition to see who can recognize the places of registration of six consecutive cars. We are quite good on our local letters—no one will catch us out on AB or UY or WP, for we know that they all mean that the cars were registered in Worcestershire. And, of course, we understand that, if a car has three registration letters, the first is a prefix and (except for GPO) merely adds variants to the last two letters.

We are learning quite a lot of the letters from other parts of the country, too. It is quite fun

trying to imagine how a WR has found its way from distant Yorkshire to the little lane in North Wales where we spotted it. But, try as we may, we seldom manage to get our half-dozen in a row. There's always one we don't recognize. So John sits with the A.A. Handbook in his lap and puts us right when our memories fail.

But I've noticed a very interesting thing whilst we have been doing this. More often than not, a driver drives more skilfully when he is approaching his home ground. He knows exactly how to take each bend in the road, and precisely where to be on the alert for things coming out of side roads. Of course, he cannot know when some new and unexpected obstacle will be in his way: we all have to exercise tremendous care on our crowded roads in these dangerous days. But in general he knows the road; and that is a great help.

So I have found myself looking out for motorists who are going into their home areas, and have tried



to follow them, making use of their signals and their extra care. If I am getting into some of the winding roads in Cheshire, I look out for a car with an FM registration. Chester is his home, and it is likely that he will know those bends better than I do. If I am going north through Warrington, I'm on the look-out for an ED. By the time I am nearing Preston, it's CK I am looking for. And so on.

No one can warn us of all the dangers we are likely to encounter in life. No one can prepare us for all the temptations. But there are people who know the way, and we do well to follow them.

There is an old story which many ministers will recall, because it was a favourite tale of the Principal of our Theological College. He used to say that there was once a steamer moving gently down the Hoogly River from Calcutta. Strangely, that river has great drifting sandbanks which continually change their position, which is most disconcerting. So, of course, vessels come down the river in charge of pilots.

On this trip an Indian pilot was in charge, and the British captain, just to make conversation, said, 'I suppose, Pilot, you know exactly where the sandbanks are this morning?' 'I have no idea', replied the pilot. The skipper was alarmed. 'What do you mean? Are you steering my vessel with its precious cargo, and you do not know where the sandbanks are which may wreck us all?' 'No, I have no idea', repeated the pilot, 'but I know every inch of the deep water'. And he was steering the ship in the channels where he knew the water was deep and safe.

That's it. No one can tell us just when we are likely to meet a situation which will test our character, and may indeed threaten to 'sink' us. Who knows whether I shall be tempted to tell a 'whopper' to-day, or to lose my temper? But we know where the 'deep water' is.

We are safe when we are on the King's Highway. Perhaps that was part of what the Fourth Evangelist meant when he said that Jesus spoke of Himself as 'The Way'. It is safe going when we keep close by Him.

#### The Trav-o-lator

By RITA F. SNOWDEN, AUCKLAND,  
NEW ZEALAND

It is always exciting to go to the great city of London—but now excitement is added to excitement. Clever engineers have found a way for people like you and me to walk under the river, by standing still. They have installed what they call a 'Trav-o-lator'. I must tell you about it. It's the longest moving footway in the world; and it reaches from Waterloo Station where the trains come in to the Bank of England.

Waterloo is one of the largest stations in Europe. Thousands and thousands of men and women and boys and girls pass through it every day. It has twenty-five platforms above the ground and six underground. It is so large that its roof covers thirteen acres; and although there is a lot of the station which is glass, the part which has to be painted takes twelve tons of paint to cover it. So you can guess what a big, busy place it is.

Until lately, those who came into Waterloo Station, and wanted to go to the Bank, had to make their way underground by a giant sub-way—like Alice in Wonderland, going down the rabbit-hole—though this was a lot bigger, and it went right under the river Thames. If it happened to be holiday-time, and you were carrying your suit-case or even a middling-sized bag, it got very heavy, and the way seemed far more than a hundred yards. Every now and again there were flights of steps, but even so, the grade was steep enough to puff people in a hurry, or those carrying luggage.

Now all that is changed. And the Trav-o-lator carries the milling crowds.

The Trav-o-lator is really a moving platform. And all you have to do is to stand on it—just like you stand on a street—holding your luggage, and it will carry you swiftly and smoothly under the river and up-hill to the Bank. It is strong enough to carry ten thousand people an hour—a hundred-and-eighty people a minute. And you don't have to do a thing! Isn't that wonderful?

Lots of boys and girls, I'm sure, wish life was like that—that you could step on to a Trav-o-lator at the bottom class at school, and suddenly find yourself at the top; that you could step on as a boy or a girl, and find yourself carried up the steep slope to manhood and womanhood; that you could begin to be a Christian, and just by standing still, find yourself soon full of courage and joy and strength, like Jesus Christ.

But you can't; life isn't like that—and I'm glad. It is one thing to go up the stiff hundred yards slope from Waterloo Station to the Bank, but if life had no places where we were challenged to climb, I think it would become a bit dull. Don't you? For that's where purpose comes in, and courage, and perseverance—and without these, life wouldn't be half the grand, exciting thing it is. And there wouldn't be any heroes and heroines. But God has made it this way, so that we can not only admire them—brave, strong, splendid men and women, winning through despite all difficulties—but we can be like them. The heroes and heroines whom we most admire have never asked for any easy way—a giant Trav-o-lator to carry them without any effort up the steep places. And it is just as well.

One of the world's heroes was Paul; he knew



this, and rejoiced in it, and cried: 'I *press on!*' 'One thing I do, forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead, I *press on!*' (Ph 3<sup>13f</sup>. R.S.V.).

And that has always been the secret of our world's heroes and heroines.

## The Christian Year

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

### Beyond Condemnation

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE W. H. LOUDON, B.D.,  
S.T.M., BOLTON AND SALTOUN

'... condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned...'—Lk 6<sup>37</sup>.

Thou judgest us: Thy purity  
Doth all our lusts condemn.

The words are familiar enough—too familiar to be frightening. Yet what they add up to is this, that by His coming amongst us, Jesus has condemned us all.

But it was not for this that He came—'God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world'—His purpose reached beyond that—but that the world through him should be saved'. His purpose went beyond condemnation; and so must ours if we are to interpret this command of our Lord's which is our text, and apply it in and to our own lives. We, too, must go *beyond condemnation*; but how often, wittingly or unwittingly, we stop just there.

1. Take first of all what happens in our day-to-day living. How much does condemnation—and by that we mean the kind of behaviour which stops at condemnation and does not go beyond it—figure in our ordinary contacts with our fellow-men? More pointedly, how many days in a week do we manage to get through without condemning some one in this fashion?

Our first inclination, probably, is to say that 'Of course, I *never* do anything of that sort'; but is that really accurate? If we set ourselves to check carefully on our conversation and behaviour even for a single day, we should find more words and sentences of condemnation than we imagined possible. 'Such and such a man is a ne'er-do-well'—'So-and-so is too sharp to be honest'—'Mrs. X is a bad mother'—'I wouldn't like to have Miss Y for a neighbour'—isn't this the kind of thing we say, and say quite often? And—here is the real trouble—having said that, or something like it, we stop there. We do not go beyond it. It is this way of condemning others, so our Lord seems to be telling us, that will bring condemnation on ourselves.

But why? After all, we haven't said anything that is not true. Only, in such cases, it is what we have *not* said that matters—what we have not said or have not done. Our condemnation is that of the barren fig-tree in the parable. Our attitude towards those whom we condemn is sterile, unfruitful, unproductive of good. Yet we claim to be followers of Him who came, not to condemn the world, but that the world through Him should be saved.

'All this', we may say, 'is making a mountain out of a mole-hill'. But is it? Is it getting things out of perspective if we link up the redeeming work of Christ with what we happen to have said or thought about the man or woman next door? That man, that woman, is part of the world that is being redeemed; and for all you know to the contrary, you are God's agent—or His instrument, if you prefer the humbler term—in the work of redemption. To make a man honest and worthwhile, to make a woman a good mother or a better neighbour—can we be in any doubt that these are *redeeming* works? But they are works in which we can have no part while we are content to condemn and do nothing more.

2. The trouble is, condemnation *costs* nothing; it is easy to condemn—much easier than to reclaim. And that no doubt is the explanation why so many of us find it playing so large a part in our lives. It demands less thought on our part; it does not involve us in any line of costing action. This becomes even clearer when we look at the matter on a larger scale.

A few years ago, the name of Senator Macarthy was notorious throughout America, if not indeed the whole world, for the methods he adopted and advocated in opposition to Communism; and some of us were no doubt inclined to say, rather complacently, 'Well, thank goodness, we have a different way of doing things here'. But just how different is it? What is our reaction to Communism, and is it any different from Macarthy's? That is to say, is it anything other than condemnation, and nothing more?

'What more can we do?' We can try to understand it; and I say 'try' advisedly, because the effort required of us is very considerable. It really would be much easier just to dismiss all Communists as atheists—inhumane and inhuman—and leave the matter there. Yet there is scarcely any branch of Christ's Church that has not adopted precisely the opposite policy—scarcely any denomination that has not given time and thought and study to the whole business of Communist theory and practice. And it isn't because the Church—any Church—is sympathetic to Communism; it is because it is part of the Church's business, to *understand*. Without understanding there can be



no helping; and without helping there can be no redeeming.

Yes—we use that word again, and we do it with all deliberation. It may seem a wildly impossible thing to look forward to—that the grim-faced men of the Kremlin should come under the yoke of Christ; and yet we must look forward to it, if we are to be true to Him. We must be ready to go beyond condemnation into some kind of understanding; for this is something that involves the Church at more than the 'official level'. It involves the Church at the level of the individual member, the individual congregation. It involves each one of us in the resolve to go beyond condemnation in an endeavour to achieve a situation and atmosphere of spirit in which reconciliation can become real. And that we cannot do if we will not go beyond condemnation.

3. If we will not go beyond condemnation—we have been trying to see how often and how much that frame of mind can hinder Christ's work. It can be an obstacle to the redemption of our neighbour. It can be an obstacle to the redemption of the world. And even if we see that, do we also see the obstacle it puts in our own way to the same goal? If we have this spirit of condemnation in us—this unwillingness to go beyond—how can we hope to be saved? We're like the sick man whose whole system was so upset that wholesome food seemed to be turned to poison by it—all the goodness in the food was cancelled and nullified. That is what we do to the goodness of Christ, when we refuse to accompany Him beyond condemnation.

But it is not easy. Above all it is not an easy-going attitude that He seeks in us. His command puts no premium upon laxity, whether in us or in those others with whom we have to do. Jesus asked a great deal of His followers when He said 'Condemn not' and at the same time by His very presence amongst them rebuked and censured all meanness and hypocrisy and sin. He asks no less to-day of those whom He has called to be His 'working body' on the earth, when He requires of us that we go beyond condemnation in dealing with the world He came to redeem.

#### FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

#### Religion in Secret

By THE REVEREND OWEN E. EVANS, M.A., B.D.,  
MANCHESTER

'Be careful not to make a show of your religion before men; if you do, no reward awaits you in your Father's house in heaven'.—Mt 6<sup>1</sup> (N.E.B.).

This is the 'text' of a short 'sermon' which is embedded within the Sermon on the Mount. The

sermon deals with the right way of fulfilling these specifically religious obligations of the Christian life; the message is first summarized in general terms (v. 1), and then applied particularly to these three obligations of almsgiving (vv. 2-4), prayer (vv. 5-6) and fasting (vv. 16-18). These may be said to represent respectively our obligations to our fellow-men, to God and to ourselves, so that all the relationships of life are covered. The point of the whole sermon is that religion is not to be practised as an ostentatious display before men, but quietly, sincerely and unobtrusively, with no thought of gaining any applause save that of God Himself.

Those who practise their religion with an eye to winning the approbation of men receive their reward here and now in the form of just that human praise and applause which they have coveted. 'I tell you this: they have their reward already'—so runs the first part of the recurring refrain of the sermon. To seek and obtain this reward from men is to forfeit one's reward from God; whereas to practise one's religion for its own sake, regardless of other people's approval or disapproval, is to ensure the divine approbation and reward. 'Your Father who sees what is done in secret will reward you'—so runs the second part of the refrain. Thus the theme is that the religious exercises of the true Christian disciple are for God's eyes and not for man's. It may be summed up in the phrase, 'the secret of religion is religion in secret'.

This does not mean, of course, that we are to make of our religion a purely private affair, and studiously avoid giving any one the slightest impression that we are Christians. Nothing could be further from our Lord's intention. He calls His disciples 'the light of the world' and bids them let their light shine before men (Mt 5<sup>14-16</sup>); but what is important, as that saying goes on to make clear, is that when men see our good works they should give glory not to us ourselves but to God. What we are to avoid is the parading of our religion in such a way as to draw attention to ourselves.

It is this public parading of religious exercises that Jesus condemns as hypocrisy. He has in mind the type of Pharisee who, when he gave alms, always chose to do so in a public place and to make a good deal of noise and fuss about it; who always took care that when the set hours of prayer arrived he would be in the synagogue or at a busy street corner; who on the recognized fast days would appear with unwashed face and unkempt hair and beard, almost hidden under a generous smearing of ashes. In such circumstances the almsgiving, prayer and fast became nothing more than a piece of play-acting, which is precisely what the term 'hypocrisy' means.



It is significant that Jesus does not tell His disciples to ignore the obligations of almsgiving, prayer and fasting. What He does is to warn them against this hypocrisy to which the Pharisees were prone. He says in effect: 'Don't let your closest friend know about the gifts you give' (the reference to the right hand and the left is a proverbial expression for intimate friendship); 'Say your prayers in solitude, behind shut doors'; 'Do your best to look as if you were going to a party rather than observing a fast'. Why? Obviously not because there is anything shameful about what they are doing, but rather because of the danger that arises out of such publicity.

The plain fact is that love of publicity is an almost universal human failing. There are few people who do not get a strange thrill out of seeing their names in print; that is why local newspapers like to include as many names as possible in their columns. We like to be noticed, especially when we do something commendable. It may be that we do not at first do the commendable thing simply in order to be noticed and applauded, but when we find that we *are* commended for it, we feel a sense of satisfaction. And there is a subtle danger that the next time we perform the same action we shall have at least part of one eye upon the praise that we shall gain for it; and unless we are very careful, this regard for what others think of us may well grow until it becomes the primary motive for the action. Our Lord, who 'knew what was in man', was aware of this danger, and warned His followers to guard against it by doing their utmost to shun publicity where the performance of their religious duties and exercises was in question.

This danger really arises out of a wrong attitude towards religious exercises, an attitude which regards them as virtues to be consciously cultivated. If we so regard them we shall tend to become proud of them, just as we become proud of objects we produce by our own skill and effort. And as we like to display our handiwork, and rejoice in people's commendation of it, so shall we tend to make a display of our virtues and to feel satisfaction when we are praised for them.

Genuine Christian virtue, however, is unconscious of itself. Just as Moses, descending from the mountain, 'did not know that the skin of his face shone', so the true Christian is unconscious of his own virtue. When reminded of it, his reaction is one of surprise, like that of the 'sheep' in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats. The true Christian does not keep an account of his own virtues and good works; he does not even bother to remember them, let alone talk about them either to his fellow-men or to God (contrast the Pharisee who thought it necessary to remind God that he fasted twice a week and tithed all that he

got). And the reason is that he does not think of his good works as virtuous acts performed for their own sakes. He helps the poor and needy, not because to do so is virtuous, but because he is kind and sympathetic by nature and cannot bear to see others suffer. He abstains from over-indulgence in physical appetites, pleasures and comforts, not because there is any virtue in asceticism for its own sake, but because he is temperate by nature and anxious to discipline himself for a life of effective service to God and man. And he engages regularly in prayer and devotion, not because such acts of worship in themselves will make him a religious man, but because he loves God and rejoices in every opportunity of seeking communion with Him. In a word, the true Christian is interested, not so much in 'being religious' as in living close to God and loving and serving Him. And this distinction is an important one; the man whose primary interest is in 'being religious' is constantly thinking about himself, whereas the genuine Christian constantly forgets himself in his preoccupation with God. The hypochondriac is never truly healthy, and likewise the man who is for ever worrying about his own spiritual pulse and temperature is not religious in the purest, most spiritual sense. True religion is spontaneous and unself-conscious.

And the secret of it all, of course, is to be delivered from self-interest. This can only happen when God Himself becomes the dominant interest in our lives, when we fall so completely under the spell of His Divine personality as to forget ourselves in a passionate love and devotion to Him. The genuine Christian character cannot be cultivated by a studious attention to the strict performance of religious exercises, in such a way as inevitably attracts the notice of men and takes cognizance of their admiring applause. Rather is it something that must grow in us as our souls look upwards towards God and become open to the gracious influences of His Spirit. So shall we come to 'reflect as in a mirror the splendour of the Lord' and 'be transfigured into his likeness, from splendour to splendour' (2 Co 3<sup>18</sup> N.E.B.); and without our having to obtrude any of the exercises and good works which will be a natural part of our daily lives, men will know us for what we are and will give the glory not to us but to Him to whom it rightly belongs.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

### The Transformed Prophet

BY THE REVEREND JAMES WRIGHT, D.D.,  
FENWICK

'How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land'.—Ps 137<sup>4</sup>.



'And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation'.—Rev 5<sup>9</sup>.

The author of the Psalm and the author of the Book of Revelation were in a similar plight. Each had been deported by the enemy, the former from Jerusalem to the city of Babylon, and the latter, John by name, to the small isle of Patmos. John would appear to have the greater cause for dejection. The guards over the Psalmist asked him to take his harp and sing to them, which surely betrays a friendly attitude towards him. One can hardly imagine that the guards in charge of the convict doing hard labour in Patmos had any such kindly feelings; and yet, the exile in Babylon has no heart to sing, whereas John in Patmos is full of triumphant songs.

The dejection of the Psalmist, so his words make clear, arose from the fact that all he cared for lay behind him in the city from which he had been carried away, and were 'joys departed, never to return'. The joy of John derived from the fact that what he treasured lay before him in the Heavenly City to which his Lord was leading him. The one, in short, could not sing for thinking of the Old Jerusalem and the other could not help singing for thinking of the New Jerusalem; and this difference is to be explained by the fact that between these two stands the figure of Jesus Christ who transforms the human prospect.

1. He has transformed the prospect for the human race. No one, knowing anything at all about Jesus, will entertain the idea that His victory over death and the Cross was to Him a merely personal victory. He knew how much was at stake in His encounter with His foes. He knew that no less was at stake than the saving of mankind, the securing of a triumphant destiny for our race. The Jewish leaders and Pontius Pilate, the Roman Governor, were immediately responsible for His execution, but well He knew that these were but the weapons, ready to their hand, of the powers of evil which threaten our race with final disaster. That and no less was what His victory averted.

The ancients placed the Golden Age of mankind in the distant past. The optimists of the nineteenth century placed it in the not far distant future. The French Revolutionaries are credited with claiming that given a fortnight in power, they would produce the perfect human society. Some of the thinkers of our disillusioned day dismiss the Golden Age of the past and the Golden Age of the future alike as myths and profess doom ahead in one form or another. It could come through

atomic war. Or it could come through the triumph of dictators—the disappearance of human liberty and dignity, the reduction of mankind to a race of robots. The instruments for this are ready to hand—the control of the press and radio, the manipulation of the minds of men by drugs. And it could be done, and have men well content in their chains, with no thought or desire to rebel, unconscious of having lost their dignity as human beings.

The Christian is under no obligation to believe, or to prove that these things might not happen. The writer of the Book of Revelation certainly foresaw dread events in the foreground of his future, but the believer in Christ and His decisive victory must hold that they would be but temporary set-backs. The Christians, of whom there are many in the ranks of the 'Ban-the-Bomb' marchers, cannot agree with those of their fellows who hold that unless the 'Bomb' is banned the human race will end in the City of Destruction. They must, to be true to the promise of Christ, continue with those who singing songs of expectation are marching to the promised land.

2. Christ transforms the prospect for the individual. I can recall reading that when Christian missionaries first settled to their task of evangelism in the East and began to win converts, the Buddhist priests, who had till then had it all their own way, took alarm. They asked what it could be in Christianity that attracted people and which was lacking in their religion. One obvious difference came to their minds—the Christian sang and their adherents never sang. This was not to be wondered at. The Buddhist has so little in his prospect to sing about. What he was taught to hope for—if you can call it hoping—was, as his final end, absorption in the infinite, like a drop of water falling into the ocean and ceasing to have any separate existence—no bright prospect, surely for a being whose life so largely consists in knowing and being known, in loving and being loved.

Jesus certainly offers a more heart-warming outlook than that. The Christian creed calls it the resurrection of the body, better expressed for the modern mind as the resurrection of personality. As He rose from the dead, still Himself, so shall it be with those who are His own. They shall all be gloriously changed and yet be the same persons.

One of the developments of our time, and greatly to its credit, is the increased care and concern for ageing folk. They have pensions, seeing and hearing aids, Eventide Homes, generally beautiful without and cosy within, and most recently, the exclusive attention of a branch of the medical



profession, the geriatricists. No one will doubt that all this is after the mind of Christ. On His Cross, almost with His latest breath, He committed His ageing mother to the care of John. That makes plain what He wishes to see done for those no longer able to bear the full burden of life.

But well pleasing as all this is in His sight, what does it amount to? It makes the going down the hill easier certainly, but it does nothing to dispel the fear that ahead lies endless night.

Jesus does better than that for those nearing their end. He gives them cause to finish their earthly course singing the songs of expectation. The Gaelic word for the realm beyond the grave is *Tir nan Og*, the land of the ever young—bringing back the powers and vitality which had withered and adding those things which 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, . . . which God hath prepared for them that love him'.

One would expect every mortal to find it an attractive prospect, but even in a country like ours where there are few unaware that this is the destiny to which Christ undertakes to lead us, what a multitude there is—the majority I should say—who couldn't care less. But let the doctors announce their discovery of a new treatment which will cure a disease hitherto incurable and everybody is agog with excitement, yet all it will do is stretch for some by a little the mortal span, while Christ promises immortality. There must be some explanation of this and maybe we professing Christians are in part at least that explanation. I recall reading a novel many years ago. In it a man attended the funeral of a friend. He himself was an unbeliever. As he listened to the minister reading over the grave the words of Jesus, 'I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth on me though he were dead yet shall he live', he felt that if he could really accept that, it would completely change his whole life. Then he looked around at the others gathered there. They were his neighbours and he knew them well, knew that they went to church and professed the Christian faith, but knew also, as he put it, that 'by to-morrow they would be at each other's throats, scrambling desperately for some ephemeral advantage'. Let us reveal to the onlooker that we really believe in our heavenly destiny, and are raised above self-preservation and self-aggrandisement—that the direction of our life is set by the goal of Christlikeness—and he will not find it so easy as now to view the Christian's goal as a baseless fantasy.

'Now unto him that is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, To the only wise God our Saviour, be the glory and the dominion. Amen.'

## SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

## Our Lord's Command

BY THE REVEREND ERIK ROUTLEY, M.A., B.D., D. PHIL.  
EDINBURGH

'Bring him to me'.—Mk 9<sup>19</sup> (N.E.B.)

'Bring him to me.' There is our Lord's great and universal commission to His Church. 'He is in trouble. He is out of his mind. He is helpless; bring him to Me. A man here, a woman there, a community, a society, a nation, a world—in trouble, out of their minds, and helpless: bring them to Me.'

As for this boy who has fits, around whom people are gathered as they gather round a street accident, it could hardly be worse. They want the Master, and they want Him badly. There he is—down again in the dust, writhing and foaming. They have asked the disciples to do something, and the disciples have botched it. When the Master comes, what will He say? Come to that, when Peter and James and John come with Him down from the hill, what will they say? (But it is all very well for them, going off for an early morning walk with the Master and leaving the work to others.) It has been a terrible let-down for the gospel, a set-back for the Master's mission. It could hardly be worse.

The Master loses no time. At once He moves into the situation. There is no doubt about either His rebuke or His mercy. But the way the story is told makes one thing very clear: that nobody present was excluded from His rebuke or from His mercy. The disciples were ready for it: the father, perhaps, less ready. 'O faithless generation!'—no, it was not blame for wrongdoing, but just the Master's sorrow at the breakdown in communication between our world and His. The awful physical perversion of the disease: the helpless anxiety: the disciples' bungling—all of it part of the same sorry tale; the communication has broken down. Heaven is divorced again from earth. Nothing ever gave the Master such sorrow as the sight of that. When He says 'faithless' He always means that. Here is the God of all goodness waiting to speak with His people; and there are the people just not hearing the message. A conspiracy of interference all along the line causes communication to break down. It is this that makes life and death bitter for the Lord.

'Bring him to me.' That is His abrupt and convincing command.

Need we spend much time in pointing the precision of this story as a story of our world? Man or woman, family, community, society, nation, world; our relation with reality is most of the time like that of the wretched patient who has fits. Part of the time we are uncomprehendingly accepting what God is doing; part of the time we



are eaten up with grievance and wrath, tormented with fear and mistrust of reality. 'How long has he been like this?' 'From childhood.' From childhood—ever since our first disobedience, we have been subject to this disease: alternations of resentful acceptance and violent fits. 'Often it has tried to make an end of him by throwing him into the fire or into water.' What nation's history could not be written in just that one sentence? Scorched and ravaged by war, drowned by poverty and oppression. 'He has been like this from childhood.' Or what person may not be so described? Burnt up by anger or lust or greed: drowned in despair or pride or covetousness. Hot or cold, one or the other and often both. That is every one of us. The individual blames society: society blames the individual.

Master, if you can do anything, do it before it is too late! We are all at our last gasp!

'Bring him to me.'

Yes. Well, we are doing what we can. It is, of course, in the natural order of things that days of heightened fear and worry like these should produce a heightened activity on the part of the Church in evangelism. Never were so many disciples pricked in their consciences: never were they so busy with appeals from the world to act in the name of Christ; never so ready to devise new methods of evangelism. Never (for we are all sinners, God help us) so ready to criticize each other. Modern evangelism has brought with it new fanaticisms and new hatreds and new contempt. The more zealous you are to obey this word of the Lord (and you must be zealous) the greater the temptation to be narrow, bossy, blinkered, high-minded and proud. You must be zealous; you must invite the temptation; and you must resist it in the name of the Lord.

Our Lord's word to this situation is threefold.

1. First, it is a command: 'Bring him to me'. There must be no self-deception about it. Nothing is easier than to say that this world needs Christ. Everybody says that except the most ferocious of the atheists. All Christians say it with singular unction, and follow it with devastating clerical platitudes.

But more devastating is the directness of the demand. Note how the Master brushes the disciples aside, and says to the father, 'You bring him'. Remember that it is the people with whom you are in contact whom you must bring to Christ. Don't wait for the professionals to do it. Resist the hideous clericalism of modern Christianity (especially of modern Scotland). The first stages of the ambulance-work are more likely to be your job than the minister's. *You* bring him. By your example, your infection, your wisdom, *you* bring him.

Make often this prayer: 'Lord, I believe: help

thou my unbelief!' 'What?' says the father, 'me approach you?' 'Yes. Bring him here to Me.' The love of the father for his child was enough to do the rest. To bring a suffering world to Christ you must love it, not patronize it. You must be involved with it, not stand aside from it (that was the disciples' trouble). Be heard more often in praise than in blame, in invitation than in censure. Take a high line in criticizing those trifles which Christians commonly denounce as unworthy only if you take a higher line in common kindness and service.

2. The father expected more than the disciples did. The disciples were not sure. The father, knowing less, was still sure. The mediation of Christ's healing is at once paralyzed if we say, 'Perhaps He will do it'. If we risk nothing on our belief, if we are not in danger of losing all on it, then we are outside the whole situation and can help nobody. The father said: 'You can, and you will'. The disciples said 'Perhaps. But we may get it all wrong.' How we need help from our unbelief! How little willing we are to say 'Christ can, and Christ will!' So much of us is all the time saying, 'No. Don't be silly. Lepers, yes. Epileptics, yes. Blind men, yes. Lunatics, yes. But nuclear bombs, no. Juvenile delinquency, no. Unbridled financial greed, no. Mixed-up relations between labour and management—no. Not on this scale.' That is where the leakage comes. All the power of Christ running away into the sand because we will not say 'help this child' and 'help my unbelief'.

3. 'There is no means of casting out this sort, but by prayer'. Clearly that is so. The father knew what prayer was, the disciples did not. Disciples are always liable to make prayer a formal thing. Set times of day. Half an hour before breakfast. Are you a church member anyhow? Well, if you don't read your Bible assiduously and set aside special times for prayer, what can you expect? All these books about prayer and devotion. . . .

But the father knew about prayer. Prayer for him was need, prayer was life. At that moment, he was not making a prayer. He *was* a prayer. The whole man was a prayer. Nothing else, to be sure, is the Christian doctrine of prayer but this, to turn to the Lord as a child to its father, as the father of a sick child to the Healer.

Disciples! Learn so to live that fathers dare to do this for their children and for themselves. Disciples, do not make long prayers in the marketplace. Be prayer: live prayer: and then, though it has often cast them into the fire and into the water, the world will go and learn what this meaneth: 'Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it'.



## Recent Foreign Theology

**The Jerusalem Bible.** The original editions of the fine French translation of the Bible published under the direction of the Dominican School in Jerusalem, and the revised editions of a number of the volumes, have been noted in these columns. Four other volumes of the revised edition have now been issued, two Old Testament volumes (Jeremiah, Lamentations, Baruch and Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel) and two New Testament volumes (the Epistles of the Captivity and Revelation).<sup>1</sup> The two Old Testament volumes are practically unchanged in length, but to say this gives a misleading idea of the amount of the revision. The two New Testament volumes are several pages longer than the former editions. The very remarkable success which this version has had fully justifies the effort to polish and improve it, and while the notes are very brief, they are thoroughly scholarly and of high value.

**Christian Encounter.** A very remarkable volume of studies has been edited by M. Roesle and O. Cullmann,<sup>2</sup> the one a Roman Catholic and the other a Protestant. The essays are on seventeen different subjects, on almost all of which there is a Catholic and a Protestant contribution. For Catholic and Protestant writers to contribute to a single volume is in no way new, but for them to write on common themes is unusual. Agreement between Catholic and Protestant is not yet in sight, but mutual understanding is growing, and collaboration in many fields of scholarship is increasing. The themes dealt with in this volume are those on which division has been deepest, such as Scripture and Tradition, Faith and Sacrament, Justification and Sanctification, Peter the Rock, the Position of Peter in the Early Church, and the Virgin Mary. The volume has therefore the character of a debate between Christians, far removed from the polemics of earlier days, and is in line with the ecumenical temper and spirit of our day. The publishers, one Catholic and one Protestant, surmise that many readers on both sides will find this volume surprising. It is equally certain that many will find it illuminating. It is published as a *Festschrift*, to mark the seventieth birthday of O. Karrer, who supplies an autobiographical Introduction, and it takes this form because he has himself played a noble part in

working for mutual understanding between the Christian communions.

**Jews and Jesus.** From Germany comes an interesting work dealing with the debate between Jews and Christians in the form of a study of the attitude of some Jewish writers to Christianity and to Jesus.<sup>3</sup> The author, Gerhard Jasper-Bethel, selects a number of writers of 'Renaissance Judaism', and offers an exposition and analysis of their thought. The authors chosen for treatment are Constantin Brunner, Franz Werfel, Nathan Birnbaum, Leo Baeck, Josef Klausner, the novelists Shalom Asch and Max Brod, Martin Buber, and Franz Rosenzweig. Not all of these will be equally known to Christian readers, and this examination of their thought from the Christian side will be found illuminating. In a final chapter the author emphasizes the fact that the Christological question is the boundary of the debate between Judaism and Christianity. As with the debate mentioned in the preceding note, it is idle to suppose that the barriers are likely to disappear. Yet here, as there, mutual understanding and respect are growing, and the more we know what is on the other side of the barrier the better.

**Psalms 45.** In recent years there have been a number of monographs devoted to the study of single psalms. The latest is a dissertation, presented in Rome but written in English, which comes from the pen of P. J. King and deals with Ps 45 (44 in the Vulgate).<sup>4</sup> The author surveys the history of the interpretation of this psalm, offers a full Introduction and commentary on the text, and a final chapter on its Messianic significance. He thinks that the primary reference of the psalm is to the marriage of Solomon to one of his wives, but at the same time holds that the Messianic interpretation is inescapable. He therefore finds here an example of the 'compensation' for which the late Father C. Lattey contended, or the *sensus plenior* for which Mgr. J. Coppens contends, and holds that the historical king prefigures the ideal sovereign of the future.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester

<sup>3</sup> *Stimmen aus dem neureligiösen Judentum in seiner Stellung zum Christentum und zu Jesus* [1958]. Herbert Reich, Evangelischer Verlag, Hamburg-Bergstedt; DM. 10.00.

<sup>4</sup> *A Study of Psalm 45 (44)* [1959]. Pontificia Universitas Lateranensis, Rome.

<sup>1</sup> Published by Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris [1959].

<sup>2</sup> *Begegnung der Christen* [1959]. Evangelisches Verlagswerk, Stuttgart, and Josef Knecht, Frankfurt am Main.



## Entre Nous

### The Universal Voice

There is no more fascinating book than an anthology which takes a man out into realms beyond his common reading and study. In *Lamps of Fire : The Spirit of Religions* (Methuen ; 21s. net) Juan Mascaró has given us a very unusual anthology. In 1958 this book was published in a limited and expensive edition of only two hundred copies, and author and publisher have done well to bring it nearer the reach of every one in price. The book consists of a selection of passages from 'the Scriptures and Wisdom of the World', passages which are 'lamps of fire'. The catholicity of this book may be seen from the fact that on successive pages the Koran, St. Francis, the Upanishads, Ecclesiasticus, Wordsworth, Sahajram, and Meister Eckhart follow each other in immediate succession. Altogether eighty-one authors or sources are quoted.

We have the prayers of the great religions. From the Upanishads we have :

From the unreal lead me to the Real.  
From darkness lead me to Light.  
From death lead me to Immortality.

From the Hindu Chaitanya we have :

'I pray not for wealth, I pray not for honours, I pray not for pleasures, or even for the joys of poetry. I only pray that during all my life I may have love : that I may have love to love thee.'

From a Gujarati song we have :

'Lord, forbid it that I should cast my eyes on things that bring evil thoughts. Far better that I were blind.

Lord, forbid it that I should foul my lips with any words stained with filth. Far better that they were sealed.

Lord, forbid it that I should hear any word of injury to another, or listen to a word of contempt. Far better that I were deaf.

Lord, forbid it that I should look with lust on those who should be sisters to me. Far better that I were dead.

Lord, let me flee from this world of sense to find eternal peace in thee.'

Here we have St. Francis :

'O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled, as to console ; to be understood, as to understand ; to be loved, as to love. For it is in giving that we receive ; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned ; it is in dying that we are born to eternal life.'

There are what we might call recipes for the good life. From the Tao Te Ching (the oftentimes quoted source in the book) we have :

There are three treasures which I prize above all things :

The first is love,  
The second is moderation,  
The third is humility.

He who has love can truly be brave ;  
He who has moderation can have in abundance ;  
He who has humility can truly have power.

But now men want bravery, and not love ;  
They want abundance, and not moderation ;  
They want power, and not humility.

This is death.

For he who fights with love will win the battle.

There are the beliefs which William James lists as the basic characteristic beliefs of the Christian life :

'1. That the visible world is part of a more spiritual universe from which it draws its chief significance.

'2. That union or harmonious relation with that higher universe is our true end.

'3. That prayer or inner communion with the Spirit thereof—be that Spirit "God" or "Law"—is a process wherein work is really done, and spiritual energy flows in and produces effects, psychological or material, within the phenomenal world.

'Religion includes also :

'4. A new zest which adds itself like a gift to life, and takes the form either of lyrical enchantment or of an appeal to earnestness and heroism.

'5. An assurance of safety and a temper of peace, and, in relation to others, a preponderance of loving affections.'

There are sayings which are part of the common wisdom of the ages. Kabir says : 'Listen to me, friend : he understands who loves'. One of the principles of Jainism is : 'If a man conquered in battle a thousand and a thousand more, and another man conquered himself, his would be the greater victory. Why fight with other men ? Fight with your own self, and attain true joy and glory.' Wisdom is 'to know what we know and to know what we do not know'.

Gather where you will in this anthology, you will find precious flowers.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED  
Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK  
38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested  
that all literary communications be addressed to  
THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.